2004

Measuring the impact of higher education on student development regarding racial attitudes and support for race-based policy

Timothy Donald Levonyan Radloff
Iowa State University

NOTE TO USERS

Measuring the impact of higher education on student development regarding racial attitudes and support for race-based policy

by

Timothy Donald Levonyan Radloff

A dissertation submitted to the graduate faculty

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Major: Sociology

Program of Study Committee:
Gloria Jones-Johnson, Co-major Professor
Betty Dobratz, Co-major Professor
Carl Roberts
J. Herman Blake
George Jackson

Iowa State University

Ames, Iowa

2004

Graduate College

Iowa State University

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation of

Timothy Donald Levonyan Radloff

has met the dissertation requirements of Iowa State University

Signature was redacted for privacy.

Co-Major Professor

Signature was redacted for privacy.

Co-Major Professor

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Major Program

DEDICATION

And the last monster that shall be throttled forever methinks is race prejudice. Men will here learn that a race, as a family, may be true to itself without seeking to exterminate all others.

-Anna Julia Cooper

To all of those grassroots movements that arose on college campuses and universities for the purpose of eradicating racism and racial prejudice by promoting education as the key to unlock the door of ignorance. Their undying faith and sacrifice to better the human condition has uplifted my heart to improve the role of education in eradicating racial prejudice and racism in academia.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the educational effect of diversity course graduation requirements on undergraduate students' racial attitudes and support for race-based policy at a predominantly White Midwest university. The present research utilized social structural variables as well as classical and contemporary measures of prejudice and racism to analyze undergraduate students' racial attitudes toward African Americans and support for race-based policy. There were four major objectives in this study: 1) To consider whether or not the diversity course graduation requirements at a Midwest university reduce racial prejudice and racism which in turn would increase support for race-based policy. 2) To examine how political conservatism and interracial friendship before college could moderate the diversity course effect on racial prejudice and racism. 3) To identify the nature of Whites' racial attitudes toward Blacks, and 4) To offer a sociohistorical explanation of why racial conflict and controversies still persist in higher education, especially in predominantly White universities. To accomplish these four major objectives, an 85-question survey on the Internet was administered to undergraduate students at two different time periods during the 2000-01 academic year employing two different data collection techniques. Undergraduate students were contacted in their classes and asked to complete an 85-question survey on the Internet that consisted of primarily five-point Likert items with responses ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." Factor analyses were used to ascertain the empirical independence of the classical and contemporary measures of prejudice and racism. Similar to some previous studies, even though there were strong correlations between some of the classical and contemporary measures of prejudice and racism, the factor analysis yielded old-fashioned and contemporary measures of prejudice

and racism as separate measures that can be empirically differentiated. There was no significant course effect on undergraduate students' level of racial prejudice and racism in the first study, and the number of interracial friendships and political conservatism did not have an impact on this relationship. However, in the second study that used a pre/posttest design, students who had already fulfilled their diversity course requirement and were taking additional race-based courses, were less prejudiced than those students who just started their first race-based course. Egalitarianism and affective prejudice are most consequential in predicting levels of opposition for race-based policy designed to reduce racial inequality. Anti-Black affect (negative stereotypes) and individualism significantly explain symbolic racism. Controlling for racial prejudice, political attitudes, and socio-demographic variables revealed that even though undergraduate students adhere to the basic American values of equal opportunity, they are less likely to support race-based policy.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

There is a growing recognition among American citizens that our nation's work force is becoming increasingly diverse as a result of socio-demographic factors, accelerated global migration, and civil rights legislation. Consequently, American higher education in the beginning of the 21st century stands at the threshold of helping students become sensitive to other cultures and preparing them to meet the challenges of responsible citizenship needed to work in a culturally diverse global community. One initiative widely practiced in American higher education is requiring undergraduate students to take diversity or multicultural courses in the hopes of helping students develop the knowledge, attitudes, and skills needed to make our nation more democratic and just (Banks, 1996; Downey & Torrecilha, 1994). These valiant diversity-related initiatives have not gone unnoticed. In 1998, President Clinton's Advisory Board on Race and Racial Reconciliation identified educational institutions as having the potential to improve interracial understanding by addressing issues of racial inclusion, social justice, and equality for the 21st century (Advisory Board, 1998).

Consequently, the implementation of diversity course graduation requirements imposes new demands on curriculum development and course design for multicultural courses, including the sociology of race and ethnicity. The U.S. Diversity/International Perspectives Requirements at Iowa State University (ISU) that took effect in fall 1997 are examples of such requirements.

However, the irony is that even though predominantly White universities and colleges are taking a proactive role by requiring their undergraduate students to take multicultural courses before they graduate, interracial tension and conflict still persist inside and outside the classroom all over the nation (Banks, 1996; Feagin, Vera, and Imani, 1996; Hurtado,

Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, and Allen, 1999). Concurrently, sociologists are not only examining race relations at colleges and universities, but also implementing new pedagogical methods that allow students to question their preconceived notions and attitudes based on race (Downey and Torrecilha, 1994; Feagin et al., 1996; Jakubowski, 2001; Lucal, 1996; Marullo, 1998; Obach, 2000). In addition, some sociologists are focusing their attention on ways to reduce racial prejudice as a method of reducing the potential for interracial tension and conflict on college campuses (Bobo, 2000; Feagin et al., 1996; Hughes, 1997; Marullo, 1998).

However, in spite of these efforts, some race relations studies revealed that increased interracial contact and efforts to diversify the curriculum at predominantly White colleges and universities does not necessarily lead to reduced prejudice and racism among students (Bonilla-Silva, 2003; Feagin, et al., 1996; Hurtado et al., 1999; Sampson, 1986; Sidanius, Pratto, and Bobo, 1996). In fact, over the past 50 years, even though research has shown that old-fashioned racism or traditional prejudice (e.g., inferiority of Blacks and negative stereotypes) among Whites has declined, support for policy to reduce racial inequality has not increased (Bobo and Kluegal, 1993; Hughes, 1997; Jackman and Muha, 1984; Kleinpenning and Hagendoorn, 1993; Tumin, Barton, and Burrus, 1958). If the research findings unequivocally support Gunnar Myrdal's (1944) argument that mass education inhibits the expression of racial prejudice and racism, why are Whites not supporting race-based policy to reduce inequality? In addition, why are racial conflicts and controversies on the rise at predominantly White colleges and universities? This study addresses these two perplexing questions by attempting to examine and conceptualize the nature of contemporary racial prejudice and racism among undergraduate students at a Midwest university.

Many non-racial and racial theoretical explanations have been proposed in the literature on why education has not been effective in reducing racial prejudice and racism. The most prominent non-racial explanation is that Whites (typically those with a politically conservative view) may believe that racism and discrimination are of the past, and because inequality is necessary for a healthy economy, race-based policies that promote racial equality are unfair and unnecessary (Jackman and Muha, 1984; Margolis and Hague, 1981; Sidanius, Pratto, Bobo, 1996; Williams, Jackson, Brown, Torres, Forman, and Brown, 1999). According to the non-racial political explanation, neither political conservatism nor conservative opposition to race-based policy is driven by negative racial attitudes but rather concern for maintaining color-blindness and egalitarian conservative values.

There are two very prominent racial theoretical explanations: The social structural approach and the social psychological approach. The social structural approach argues that Whites hold a dominant position in the social structure (i.e., Whites occupy most of the managerial and professional occupations and key leadership positions in the government) and will strive to maintain their privileged status in the wake of racial integration (Bobo, Kluegal, and Smith, 1997). The social psychological approach purports that Whites believe that racism and discrimination are of the past and that Blacks violate such traditional American values as individualism and the work ethic (Hughes, 1997; Kinder and Sears, 1981; Kleinpenning and Hagendoorn, 1993). According to the social psychological approach, Whites are not supporting race-based policy because Whites harbor negative racial feelings toward Blacks for not working hard to get ahead and thus blame Blacks for not pulling themselves up out of poverty. All three explanations—i.e., one non-racial and two racial theoretical perspectives—are considered and empirically measured in this dissertation.

This study proposes that racism is still a significant factor in American society and suggests that both social structural and social psychological factors of race could be used to explain why Whites are not supporting race-based policy to eradicate racial inequality. Both racial theoretical perspectives offer compelling arguments as to why Whites are not supporting race-based policy. However, the current debate among the leading researchers of these two racial theoretical perspectives seems to suggest that these racial theoretical perspectives cannot be integrated (Sears and Henry, 2003; Bobo, 2000). Why does it have to be one or the other?

Furthermore, it is possible that experiencing interracial contact and forming interracial friendships before college could help facilitate the learning process of becoming familiar with the experiences of diverse groups in higher education (Kinloch, 1974; Pettigrew, 1997). If this is the case, then it is possible that established interracial friendships as consequence of interracial contact before college could strengthen the educational effect of diversity courses on reducing racial prejudice and racism.

In addition, research studies have shown that political conservatism is not independent from racial prejudice and racism (Sears, van Laar, Carrillo, and Kosterman, 1997; Sidanius et al., 1996). In other words, racism is so ingrained in our society because White Americans have grown up in a socializing culture marked by widespread negative attitudes toward Blacks (Sears et al., 1997). Consequently, the political ideology of White Americans is based on serving and preserving their racial group interests (Jackman and Muha, 1986; Sears et al., 1997; Sidanius et al., 1996). If this is the case, then political conservatism could possibly affect the direction of the relationship between the diversity course graduation requirements and racial prejudice/racism.

In order to address the goals of the study, there are four major objectives: 1) To consider whether or not the diversity course graduation requirements at a Midwest university reduce racial prejudice and racism which in turn would increase support for race-based policy. 2) To examine how political conservatism and interracial friendship before college could moderate the diversity course effect on racial prejudice and racism. For example, greater political conservatism may result in lessening the diversity course effect on reducing racial prejudice and racism. In addition, interracial friendship may result in increasing the diversity course effect on reducing racial prejudice and racism. 3) To identify the nature of Whites' racial attitudes toward Blacks, and 4) To offer a sociohistorical explanation of why racial conflict and controversies still persist in higher education, especially in predominantly White universities.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Over the past five decades or so, sociological research of racial attitudes has proposed that educational attainment is strongly linked to the liberalization of White racial attitudes about integration (Farley, Steeh, Kryson, Jackson, and Reeves, 1994; Tumin et al., 1958). In 1956, Hyman and Sheatsley were the first to propose that the liberalization of White racial attitudes about integration occurs when the younger generations replace the older, less tolerant generations who have been socialized in a culture of racial segregation. Furthermore, Hyman and Sheatsley's (1956) belief in Gunnar Mrydal's (1944) argument that mass education curtails the expression of racial prejudice led them to predict that education on its own would liberalize racial attitudes.

Tumin et al. (1958) tested Hyman and Sheatsley's prediction about education's liberalizing effect on racial attitudes. In their study, Tumin et al. (1958) found that White male adults with a college education were more favorable in their attitudes toward desegregation than those Whites who did not go beyond a high school education. Tumin et al. (1958, p. 142) concluded that as individuals, through the course of formal education, become acquainted with "the needs and wishes of others, and to the prevailing mores in communities other than their own, they increase the range of reference groups which will be taken into account in his plans of action." Tumin et al. (1958) referred to this increase in the range of reference groups as countervailing perspectives, i.e., "larger perspectives to increase understanding and are developed during the course of formal education that will help to produce an increasingly mature and socially responsible individual" (p. 142).

Twenty years later, Quinley and Glock (1979, p. 188) declared that institutions of formal education reduce prejudice in the following three ways:

(1) By providing people with more knowledge about minorities and about the historical, social, and economic factors responsible for minority and majority group differences.

(2) By teaching people to recognize prejudice and to understand its dangers.

(3) By providing cognitive skills, which increase people's capacity to detect prejudice and to reject it.

These three ways are exemplified through the efforts that some predominantly white colleges and universities have made in diversifying their curriculums (e.g., the establishment of diversity course graduation requirements) to help prepare their students to meet the challenges in a diverse complex world. In fact, some sociologists who teach the sociology of race and ethnicity have proposed new pedagogical approaches to meet these new demands on diversifying the curriculum (Downey and Torrecilha, 1994; Lucal, 1996; Marullo, 1998).

Over the last decade or so, sociologists have revealed that courses on race and ethnicity have caused students to question their preconceived notions of attitudes based on race by developing an awareness of racial inequality and exposing students to new racially diverse situations inside and outside of the classroom (Marullo, 1998; Pence and Fields, 1999). Furthermore, in their study on racial integration in Detroit, MI, Farely et al. (1994, p. 758) concluded that, "Educational attainment was strongly linked to attitudes about integration." Farely and his associates (1994, p. 777) predict a further liberalization of White racial attitudes about living in integrated neighborhoods but stress that attitudinal change will occur slowly because of "the slow process of cohort replacement."

However, even though the research studies aforementioned had indicated a decline in racial prejudice and racism over the last fifty years, research studies have also shown that racial prejudice and racism still persist despite the fact that ethnic studies and diversity

courses have been implemented into the existing curricula structures at predominantly White colleges and universities (Downey and Torrecilha, 1994; Feagin et al., 1996; Sidanius et al., 1996). In order to unravel the complexity of this irony, a brief historical overview of the development of the American university is called for to capture some of the institutional dynamics of higher education in predominantly White universities.

About 10 years prior to the Supreme Court Ruling of Brown vs. Board of Education, Topeka, Kansas, (1954) that declared racial segregation in public schools unconstitutional, American universities were forming partnerships with businesses and the government. During this time (circa 1940s), the U.S. Congress was making key decisions about which general areas the partnerships between the federal government and the universities should be developed—defense, scientific and technological progress, and health (Kerr, 2001). Consequently, the research universities became more fragmented because of the rapid ascendancy of science and the new partnerships that had emerged between universities, businesses, and the government. "The model of scientific knowledge" as a professional study (e.g., abstract, quantifiable, impersonal, and value neutral approach) permeated the curriculum (Rhodes, 1998). Pedagogical approaches were not student-centered. Rather students were viewed as empty receptacles that needed to be filled with knowledge.

Even though students were encouraged to think critically about the moral issues of the day, the teaching methods did not enable students to think critically about moral issues. Consequently, "a certain revulsion against the impersonality of large organizations" emerged in the student movement (Rosovsky, 1991, p. 19). In addition, in his book, *The Uses of the University*, Clark Kerr (2001, p. 101) stated that, "Some students were beginning to visualize

themselves as the 'lumpen proletariate'—or, in more modern terminology, as prisoners in the campus ghetto..."

Given these changing dynamics within the universities, the stage was set for student protest. In fact, in his book, *The University: An Owner's Manual*, Rosovsky (1991) mentioned that the University of California, Berkeley is the birthplace of the American student revolution. Furthermore, the American university was becoming increasingly diverse because of the Supreme Court ruling of Brown vs. Board of Education, Topeka, Kansas, (1954). However, racial conflicts and controversies were also on the rise. For example, Rosovsky (1991, p. 22) pointed out that the assassination of Martin Luther King Jr. invoked "deep sorrow and guilt among liberals, riots in large cities, and feelings of anger among thinking people everywhere." Rosovsky (1991, p. 22) goes on to mention how this had a direct impact on the Harvard campus as evidenced "by militant black students demanding for greater recognition of their culture and background in the curriculum and in the research." For the first time, Harvard confronted the issue of how to serve their students "who had suffered slavery, discrimination, and the wounds inflicted by racial prejudice" (Rosovsky, 1991, p. 22).

However, as mentioned earlier, "the model of scientific knowledge" had permeated the consciousness of research universities. The quest for knowledge through scientific discovery was leading the way. Kerr (2001) pointed out that the attempted changes by the students were oriented in creating liberal knowledge and not focused on vocational and professional studies. Furthermore, Kerr (2001) mentioned that the majority of faculty did not want to make this shift to liberal knowledge because it was too much for faculty to spend the time, attention, and emotion. In fact, Kerr (2001, p. 127-128) asserted, "Faculty members

generally never liked [Black studies, Native American studies, and Hispanic studies] them; in fact, barely tolerated them." But in spite of faculty resentment, the 1968 Ethnic Heritages Act that supported the study of American ethnicities emerged from the Black and Hispanic civil rights movements of the 1960s that called for increasing racial and ethnic minority representation among faculty and diversifying the curricula to include Black, Hispanic, and Native American histories, literatures, and art (Downey and Torrecilha, 1994).

As we address the issue of multiculturalism or diversity education in the 21st century at predominantly White colleges and universities, people of diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds feel marginalized (Banks, 1996; Bonilla-Silva, 2003; Feagin et al., 1996). In fact, in the 1990s, student protests over the negative racial climate and patterns of racism occurred on all types of predominantly White campuses (Feagin et al., 1996). In addition, Downey and Torrecilha (1994) point out that students come into diversity courses with preconceived notions of racial and ethnic minority groups that run counter to the mission of the diversity course requirements. Consequently, our leading scholars, administrators, professionals, and students in universities throughout the U.S. are engaged in a vigorous debate between those who defend the established western-centric, male-dominated curriculum that is centered on the scientific ethic and those who advocate a curriculum based on liberal education that truly reflects the diversity of our American nation (Banks, 1996).

Yet, in the midst of this persistence in the patterns of racism and prejudice on predominantly White campuses, sociological research has shown that old-fashioned racism or traditional prejudice especially among the educated has declined in the last fifty years (Hughes, 1997; Jackman and Muha, 1984; Kleinpenning and Hagendoorn, 1993). For example, survey research indicates that Whites are now more likely to attribute the failure of

Blacks to structural factors rather than to their innate abilities (Kluegal 1990; Steeh and Schuman, 1992). However, many conflicting questions have arisen about the nature of Whites' racial attitudes and how they have changed since the Jim Crow era (Bobo, 2000; Bobo et al., 1997; Feagin et al., 1996 Hughes, 1997; Sears et al., 1997). In fact, other survey research indicates that Whites still hold negative stereotypes of Blacks and rely more on cultural rather than biological attributes to explain Blacks' socio-economic position relative to Whites (Bobo, 2000; Bonilla-Silva, 2003). The most prominent question presented in the research on White racial attitudes is, "Even though Whites espouse general principles of egalitarianism and racial integration, why do they oppose policy to reduce racial inequality between Blacks and Whites?"

The leading sociological research on White racial attitudes reveals that White racial attitudes have changed since the Jim Crow era, but there are conflicting views about the contemporary expressions of racial prejudice and racism (Bobo, 2000; Bobo et al., 1997; Bonilla-Silva, 2003; Hughes, 1997; Sears, Henry, and Kosterman, 2000; Sears et al., 1997). There are many theoretical explanations that sociologists have proposed to explain contemporary White racial attitudes, but three theoretical approaches to understanding White opposition to racial policy have been underscored in the literature and will be briefly discussed in this study.

THE SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL APPROACH

The first theoretical approach to emerge among these theories was *symbolic racism* (Sears and Kinder, 1971). According to this perspective, Whites believe that the civil rights movement entirely eradicated racial discrimination and thus Blacks should just work harder

to overcome their disadvantages without any special favors (Sears et al., 1997). Sears and Kinder (1971) speculated that "White racism" evolved into symbolic racism that reflects a blend of anti-Black affect and American traditional values. Operational measures of anti-Black affect include negative stereotypes of Blacks and lack of positive emotion for Blacks (Sears and Henry, 2003; Williams et al., 1999). In addition, symbolic racism has been conceptualized as the moral resentment that Whites feel toward Blacks for violating cherished American values such as economic individualism and the work ethic. In other words, Whites feel resentful of Blacks because of the preferential treatment they receive through various state and federal programs to improve their economic position (Sears et al., 1997). Consequently, even though Whites hold egalitarian beliefs, Whites believe that the government has gone too far to ensure equal opportunity among the races to the point where they feel race-based polices interfere with the American work ethic. According to Sears et al. (1997) this resentment stems from White Americans being socialized to harbor negative attitudes toward Blacks.

It is also interesting to note that studies revealed that respondent's level of education did not impact White support for race-targeted policy (Kluegal, 1990; Sears et al., 1997; Steeh and Schuman, 1992). In fact, sociological research has found that Whites, with or without a higher education, did not support such programs as school desegregation, busing, affirmative action, and open housing to address the structural inequalities between Whites and Blacks (Kluegal, 1990; Sears et al., 1997; Steeh and Schuman, 1992). Furthermore, these research studies point out that Whites believe the reason why the Black-White socioeconomic gap is so pronounced is because it is the Blacks' fault for not trying hard

enough to pull themselves up out of poverty (Farley et al., 1994; Kluegal, 1990; Sears et al., 1997; Steeh and Schuman, 1992).

THE SOCIAL STRUCTURAL AND DOMINANT GROUP APPROACH

However, on the other hand, the second theoretical approach known as the social structural perspective contends that contemporary expressions of racial prejudice and racism are shaped by Whites' protecting their privileged status (Bobo, 2000; Bobo et al., 1997). Bobo et al. (1997) introduced their theoretical concept of *laissez-faire racism* to describe how Whites make efforts to maintain or sustain their dominant position in the social structure in the wake of racial integration. The crux of their theory is this: as Whites compete for jobs, education, housing, and political positions with other racial and ethnic minority groups (e.g., Blacks), Whites will try to maintain or sustain their sense of domination in the social structure. Laissez-faire racism finds its origins in Herbert Blumer's (1958) theory on prejudice as a function of the group's position in the social structure.

Sociological research has commonly referred to the Whites as being the dominant group or the ingroup and the Blacks as the minority group (Schaefer, 1987). In these sociological studies, we typically see that Whites are more in the position to demonstrate their views against Blacks, i.e., Whites not only favor their group over Blacks but also discriminate against them. For example, Muir and Muir's (1988) study on social distance revealed that a majority of "Whites" adopt a pattern of social rejection of Blacks by their early teens. Muir and Muir's (1988) findings are "consistent with the historical monopoly of power by Whites in Western society" (Kinloch, 1974, p. 2). According to Bobo et al. (1997), Whites have ingrained negative stereotypes of Blacks that have their roots in the Jim Crow

era. In other words, Whites blame Blacks themselves for their disadvantaged social condition. It is important to mention that proponents of the symbolic racism perspective also believe that Whites have ingrained negative stereotypes of Blacks due to racial socialization and that Blacks are to blame for their poorer relative economic standing. However, according to laissez-faire theorists, the reason that Whites do not support race-based policy is because they want to protect their own social and economic interests and that Blacks are culturally inferior (Bobo et al., 1997).

According to Sidanius and Pratto (1999, p. 61), "understanding the nature and dynamics of group-based social inequality requires that we understand the psychology of group dominance." To accomplish this goal, Sidanius and Pratto (1999) introduced their theoretical concept of *social dominancy theory* to identify and describe how human social-systems produce and maintain group-based social hierarchy. Sidanius and Pratto (1999) propose that White opposition to race-based policy stems from a generalized inegalitarian perspective. According to Sidanius and Pratto (1999), the central psychological component of social dominance theory is *social dominance orientation*. Social dominance orientation "is defined as the degree to which individuals desire and support group-based hierarchy and the domination of 'inferior' groups by 'superior' groups" (Sidanius and Pratto, 1999, p. 48). For example, the more an individual subscribes to the notion of a hierarchically-arranged society with Whites at the top of the hierarchy, the more he or she will adhere to ideologies that maintain the racial status quo.

It is also interesting to note that Jackman (1978) found that while the college-educated were likely to promote general principles of egalitarianism and integration, they were not in support of policy created to attain equality and integration. In addition, in a

public opinion study that examined White racial attitudes between 1963 and 1977, Condran (1979) found that the liberalization of racial attitudes between educational levels had been decreasing. Condran (1979, p. 474) concluded that, "white Americans may have simply improved their conformity to the increasing institutionalized normative standards of an official 'liberal' society."

Jackman and Muha (1984, p. 759) offer the following explanation for the principle-implementation gap (i.e., Whites promote egalitarianism in principle but don't support governmental policy to bring about equality and integration): "Groups that occupy a dominant position in the social structure routinely manufacture an interpretation of reality and set of normative prescriptions that serve their interests." In support of their theoretical proposition, Jackman and Muha's (1984) findings show that respondents with a college education were the most sophisticated in promoting the dominant group's interests.

In a more recent study, Sidanius et al. (1996) concluded that political conservatism and classical racism has an effect on Whites' opposition to affirmative action, and this effect increases as a function of higher levels of formal education. Sidanius et al. (1996) statistically examine the relationship between classical racism, educational sophistication, and political conservatism. Sidanius et al.'s (1996) findings indicated that the bivariate relationship between classical racism and affirmative action opposition increased among groups with higher levels of educational attainment (i.e., greater educational sophistication). Furthermore, this trend held even after the simultaneous effects of political conservatism.

THE PRINCIPLED CONSERVATIVISM PERSPECTIVE

The non-racial explanation of why Whites do not support race-based policy can be described as the principled conservatism perspective (Sidanius et al., 1996). Advocates of the principled conservatism perspective argue that the reason why Whites do not support race-based policy is not driven by racism, but rather by the concern for fairness, equality, and the goal for establishing a truly color-blind society (Margolis and Hague, 1981; Sidanius et al., 1996). In fact, some analysts contend that failure to find a positive relationship between education and support of government intervention to implement race-based policy is not due to any weakness in commitment of the college-educated to racial integration, but rather reflects a dislike for any type of governmental intervention (Margolis and Hague, 1981; Krysan, 2000). Furthermore, principled conservatism theorists argue that the contemporary debate over race-based policy is driven by what the government should do based on the political party system and political ideology (Sniderman, Crosby, and Howell, 2000; Krysan, 2000). It is important to mention that principled conservatism theorists do not claim that racism is completely independent of political conservatism, but point out that there will be a significant positive correlation between racism and political conservatism among the poorly educated (Sidanius et al., 1996; Sniderman et al., 2000).

It is believed by principled conservatism theorists that those who are college-educated are more knowledgeable about the political process and consequently, are more influenced by the political system and its ideological contours of the American political landscape (Sniderman et al., 2000). It is interesting to point out that, in their recent study, Sniderman et al. (2000) found that college-educated liberals are more likely to support government assurances of equal opportunity while the college-educated conservatives oppose support

government assurances of equal opportunity. Thus, Sniderman et al. (2000) conclude that liberals and conservatives make their choices based on their political principles. For the purposes of this study, opposition to race-based policy could reflect a rigid view of political principles about the role of government in the promotion of racial equality. However, could completing the university's diversity graduation requirements sensitize students to the social structural dynamics that reproduce racial inequality? Or, better yet, does being politically conservative overshadow the impact that diversity course graduation requirements could have on students' racial attitudes? In other words, this study proposes that the more rigid the undergraduate students' views of political principles are about the role of government in promoting racial equality the less likely diversity courses will have an impact on racial attitudes.

The sociological and psychological research findings reviewed above call into question the effect education has on reducing racial prejudice and racism. Although the findings are varied and cover a broad spectrum of racial attitudes and beliefs, the researchers point to the following factors that hinder Whites' ability to question their preconceived notions and attitudes based on race: Social psychological, social structural, and political factors. However, none of these studies reviewed above take into account the impact of diversity course graduation requirements on students' racial attitudes and beliefs. Over the last decade or so, colleges and universities all over the nation have made more of an effort to help their students develop more of a well-rounded view of race relations, diversity, and international issues. Therefore, an examination of the impact of these diversity course graduation requirements on racial attitudes could reveal profound changes in the contemporary expressions of racial prejudice and racism.

CHAPTER 3: THE RACIAL SOCIALIZATION PERSPECTIVE

Research studies have suggested that the college-educated are the first to adopt and promote positive racial attitudes over time. However, although research studies show that old-fashioned racism or traditional prejudice has decreased, the research studies also indicate that racial conflicts and controversies are on the rise at predominately White colleges and universities because of racial prejudice and racism (Bonilla-Silva, 2003; Bobo, 2000; Sears and Henry, 2003). Hence, the research findings on the effects of education on racial prejudice and racism appear to be inconclusive. Therefore, in order to unravel this complexity, a micro and macro analytical framework will be employed using Omi and Winant's racial formation perspective, Herbert Blumer's (1958) theory on prejudice as a sense of group position, Blumer's (1965) model of the color line, and Pettigrew's affective approach to measuring racial prejudice.

Jacob (1957) argued that even though education promotes values such as equality, civil rights, and cultural tolerance, these values are not internalized. Rather, these values are represented as superficial socialization constructs to allow people to feel resigned with college expectations and societal norms such as equality. In other words, students passively accept values like equality and cultural tolerance without questioning their own personal biases. For the theoretical purpose of this study, the key concepts to focus on here are "internalization" and "socialization." In their classic treatise in the sociology of knowledge, Berger and Luckman (1966, p. 163) proclaimed, "The micro-sociological or social-psychological analysis of phenomena of internalization must always have as its background a macro-sociological understanding of their structural aspects." In other words, in order for

sociologists to examine how racial attitudes and values are internalized, we need to understand how the social structure affects racial attitudes and values.

Omi and Winant's (1994) racial formation perspective is one of the most significant contributions to the sociology of race and ethnicity in recent years. Omi and Winant (1994, p. 18) introduce a racial formation perspective, with the intent to deal with "race as an autonomous field of social conflict, political organization, and cultural/ideological meaning." The racial formation perspective is defined "as the sociohistorical process by which racial categories are created, inhabited, transformed, and destroyed (Omi and Winant, p. 55). Their racial formation perspective provides a theoretical conceptualization of race in social and political structures that operates on two social levels: the macro-level process (social structure) and the micro-social level (individual racial identity) (Omi and Winant, p. 56-57). In addition, Omi and Winant link the evolution of hegemony to racial formation: the way in which society is organized and ruled. For Omi and Winant, these fundamental parts woven together illustrate racial formation.

For example, in applying Omi and Winant's (1994) theoretical conceptualization of racial formation in this study, we see that White Americans hold the dominant position in the social structure in the United States because the government in the past created or sanctioned racial prejudice and racism towards racial and ethnic minorities in order to dominate them. For example, in 1857, the U.S. Supreme Court declared that Blacks "are not included, and were not intended to be included, in the word citizen in the Constitution... being subordinate and inferior class of beings" (Ruststein, 1993, p. 60). Another example, in 1896, the Supreme Court ruled that "separate but equal" accommodations for Blacks and Whites to be maintained in all public facilities including education. In fact, according to Feagin et al.

(1996, p. 7), "Discriminatory practices—for example, the legal exclusion of black students from many colleges until the 1950s or the informal discrimination directed against these students at majority-white colleges today—are generated by a range of white motivations, including prejudice, fear, and hope of personal gain." History shows us the painful struggles of Blacks fight for justice and equality in the United States.

However, the passing of the 14th and 15th Amendments (i.e., providing equal privileges of citizenship and protection of the law in 1868 and securing the right to vote in 1870) and the Supreme Court ruling of Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka in 1954 not only paved the way to eradicate Jim Crow, but also established a new political ideology that called for the removal of blatant racism (Bobo et al., 1997; Sears and Henry, 2003). It is during this eighty-six year time period that we see for the first time a shift in political ideology (i.e., from Blacks not being afforded the rights of citizenship to finally being granted the privileges of citizenship and the right to vote). According to Blumer (1965), the establishment of the political rights of Blacks is the first step towards removing the barriers of the color line. In other words, this common recognition of humanity paved the way for equality of opportunity (Kleinpenning and Hagendoorn, 1993).

However, even though the right to vote was granted and the "separate but equal" doctrine abolished, discrimination still persisted in the social, political, economic, and educational arenas of U.S. society. These discriminatory practices of White Americans, led to the collective efforts of both Whites and Blacks (civil rights movement) to eradicate racial discrimination. The fruits of this collective effort gave birth to the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 that solidified the basic citizenship rights of Blacks. Unfortunately, the collective efforts made in the civil rights movement did not end racial

inequality and racialized social identities among Blacks and Whites, but did, however, positively impact racial attitudes. For example, Robert Blauner (1989, p.317) conducted in-depth interviews of Whites and Blacks over a thirty-year period and found that "The belief in a right to dignity and fair treatment is now so widespread and deeply rooted, so self-evident that people of all colors would vigorously resist any effort to reinstate formalized discrimination." These changes in racial attitudes are especially reflected in those living outside the South, the college-educated, and the younger generations (Steeh and Schuman, 1992).

It is important to make the point that the kind of racial socialization a White person has experienced and the kind of racial contact this person has had will influence how he or she will perceive Black people and race-based policy. However, the problem of racial residential segregation has plagued the American nation for many years even in spite of the monumental accomplishments of the civil rights movement (Massy and Denton, 1993). As a result of racial residential segregation, our neighborhoods and communities are not racially integrated, especially in metropolitan areas. Given this structural arrangement due to racial residential segregation, the primary socialization of Whites (i.e., family background, community, and friends) can have a stabilizing effect on liberal views regarding White support for race-based policy to eradicate racial inequality. In other words, according to the Middle-class, the stratification system looks fair and they have little reason to ask if the system works (Schaefer, 1996). According to Berger and Luckman (1966, p. 131-132), the primary socialization is more important than the secondary socialization (e.g., government and education) for an individual because during childhood, "the child takes on the significant others' roles and attitudes, that is, internalizes them and makes them his own." In fact,

according to Jones (1972, p. 3), the problem of prejudice follows from using the standards of one's own group when comparing the self to someone in another group.

However, as Americans we are taught to be loyal to our U.S. government and abide by its laws. In his classical works, George Herbert Mead (1962, p. 154) wrote, "The organized community or social group which gives to the individual his unity of self may be called the 'generalized other'." The generalized other may be products of a politics of culture and identity, emphasizing common experience. As Mead (1962, p. 155) describes his perspective as,

> Only in so far as he takes the attitudes of the organized social group to which he belongs toward the organized, co-operative social activity or set of such activities in which that group as such engaged, does he develop a complete self or possess the sort of complete self he as developed.

According to Crosby, Bromley, and Saxe (1980), although Whites may adhere to the nondiscriminatory laws and principles of equality that are promoted by our government, they may not have internalized unprejudiced attitudes. Given the incredibly high levels of racial residential segregation in the United States, Crosby et al.'s (1980) assertion does not seem unrealistic (Bonilla-Silva, 2003; Massey and Denton, 1993).

However, Pettigrew (1997) points out that it is important not only to examine the cognitive aspects of racial and ethnic prejudice, but how the emotional or affective aspects contribute to our understanding of racial and ethnic prejudice. Pettigrew found that the power of intergroup friendship was very significant in reducing the ingroups' prejudice (especially affective prejudice) toward outgroups. In the context of this study, as Whites become acquainted with the experiences of Blacks through interracial friendship, the more likely they could become familiar with the needs and perspectives of Blacks thereby

increasing their range of reference groups. Once this occurs, this may lead to a shared sense of understanding between Blacks and Whites as Whites integrate their Black friends into their politics of culture and identity, emphasizing a common experience—i.e., the generalized other. If this is the case, then interracial friendship could enhance or strengthen the diversity course effect on improving racial attitudes.

Pettigrew (1997) concluded that individuals coming from mixed neighborhoods (with different cultures, races etc.) are more likely to have intergroup friendship, but mixed neighborhoods by themselves do not relate with affective prejudice. But most important, the diversity of the urban environment unlike rural areas increases the possibility of making interracial contact that could evolve into interracial friendship. Furthermore, the research on gender socialization revealed that women are more in favor of interracial contact than men are because women are socialized to be sensitive, care-giving, and empathetic unlike men (Hughes and Tuch, 2003; Johnson and Marini, 1998). However, it is important to point out that the theorists of racial attitudes that are primarily discussed in this dissertation have not considered gender as an important variable. Even though this study does not specifically address gender as an important variable nor examines the effect that gender socialization could have on interracial friendship, this dissertation does acknowledge the most recent research on gender socialization and in doing so incorporates gender into the data analysis.

After careful examination of the above studies, this study concludes that racial prejudice and racism are not aberrations among a few individuals of our society, but rather-racial prejudice and racism are very much products of our history and are woven into the fabric of our political and social institutions. Therefore, in order to gain an accurate understanding of how education affects racial attitudes in the United States, sociologists must

employ both micro and macro levels of analyses to examine the contemporary expressions of racial prejudice and racism. In addition, as pointed out by Omi and Winant (1994) and researchers alike, the historical and societal contexts must be taken into account in order to gain a sense of how the expressions of racial prejudice and racism can persist and change over time (Blumer, 1965; Bobo et al., 1997; Bonilla-Silva, 2003).

According to Blumer (1958), beliefs and feelings of superiority involving negative stereotypes do not in themselves constitute racial prejudice. Rather, in a racialized social order where Whites are socialized to be racially superior and dominant over Blacks (i.e., racism and the establishment of the color line) "the source of race prejudice," Blumer (1958, p. 5) argued, "lies in a felt challenge to this sense of group position." That is, when Whites feel threatened as a consequence of Blacks encroaching on their rightful prerogatives, racial prejudice serves as a defensive reaction (e.g., "Blacks are getting out of place").

Blumer's (1958) theoretical proposition of race prejudice as a sense of group position shifts our attention away from race prejudice as solely being internal psychological processes of the individual and directs our attention to how the racial status quo is maintained via normative ideas about where one's own racial group (e.g., dominant group) stands relative to the subordinate group in society on the very nature of certain rights, statuses, and resources. In doing so, Blumer (1958) provides sociological insight into how racial stereotypes and negative feelings toward Blacks (e.g., lack of positive emotion) could possibly contribute to the formulation of new forms of racial prejudice, racial ideologies, and political belief systems (Blumer, 1958; Bobo, 2000; Sears and Henry, 2003). Indeed, the broad assumptions of both symbolic racism and laissez-faire racism purport that new forms of racial prejudice

embody racial stereotypes, negative feelings toward Blacks as a group, and conservative values (e.g., political conservatism) (Bobo, 2000; Sears and Henry, 2003).

Most important, researchers point out that symbolic racism and laissez-faire racism are contemporary political belief systems or racial ideologies that are composed of negative feelings and racial stereotypes (Bonilla-Silva, 2003; Sears and Henry, 2003). However, the key distinction between laissez-faire racism and symbolic racism is that people who harbor symbolic racism resist racial change because they are resentful of Blacks for receiving "special treatment" in a political and economic system they believe is fair and color-blind (Bonilla-Silva, 2003; Hughes, 1997; Sears and Henry, 2003). For laissez-faire racists, on the other hand, Blacks constitute a threat to their social, political, and economic way of life and will do whatever is necessary to protect and maintain White privilege and superiority in the racial hierarchy (Bobo and Kluegal, 1997; Bonilla-Silva, 2003; Hughes, 1997).

This study proposes that most White students are not blatantly expressing superiority over Blacks because of the civil rights laws and social pressure to conform to contemporary cultural norms (e.g., equality and fairness) (Berinski, 1999; Bobo and Licari, 1989). In addition, colleges and universities across the nation are making efforts to improve race relations by implementing diversity course graduation requirements into their curriculum and since White students are the primary beneficiaries of these valiant and noble educational efforts, they represent a unique subgroup of the White population in the United States. However, because of racial residential segregation and the primary socialization experiences of Whites learning racial stereotypes while growing up, most Whites have difficulty coming to grips with racial discrimination in the sense that hard work alone does not guarantee success for Blacks in the labor force. In other words, most Whites do not have a conscious

awareness of how their racial status impacts their relationship with people of different color regardless of their gender and socio-economic background (Bonilla-Silva, 2003; Hughes and Tuch, 2003) Therefore, there is a tendency for Whites to believe that our American system is fair (i.e., a land of opportunity in which you need only to work hard to succeed) and that we do not need race-based policies to help Blacks. Furthermore, implementing race-based policies would violate basic norms and beliefs in our society about the proper allocation of social rewards. Consequently, Whites have negative perceptions of Blacks for making illegitimate demands on the racial status quo (Hughes, 1997).

Although this theoretical interpretation is in sync with the concept of symbolic racism (a social psychological approach), we must keep in mind that the concept of laissez-faire racism with its emphasis on unfair structural conditions and arrangements can also apply—i.e., Whites maintaining their privilege and domination in the racial social order—whether it be unconscious or conscious, unintentional or intentional is at the core of this social structural approach (Bobo, 2000). Furthermore, Whites may feel threatened as a consequence of Blacks gaining more and more access to their own rights and privileges (Bobo et al., 1997). Hence, laissez-faire racist ideology (i.e., intergroup threat) that embodies both negative stereotypes of Blacks and anti-egalitarian values emerged to defend White privilege and domination in the racial hierarchy (Bobo et al., 1997).

After all, racial inequality still exists in the United States and it is not the aim of this study to ignore the perpetuation of systemic White privilege. For example, Blacks and dark-skinned minorities "earn about 40 percent less than whites, and have about a tenth of the net worth that whites have" (Bonilla-Silva, 2003). However, testing for the perpetuation of systemic White privilege is well beyond the scope of this study and thus is not attempted.

Rather, what is most important in this study is to consider and examine how the cognitive and affective dispositions of both racial ideologies (symbolic racism and laissez-faire racism) contribute to our understanding of the nature of contemporary expressions of racial prejudice, racism, and opposition to race-based policy among White undergraduate students at a Midwest university. Indeed, in the literature, racial stereotypes are conceptualized as primarily cognitive rather than affective, and according to Thomas Pettigrew (1997), we know far more about racial stereotypes and the cognitive processes of racial prejudice than we know about the affective processes (Sears and Henry, 2003).

Furthermore, in applying the micro and macro theoretical framework unlike the research studies discussed above, this study recognizes that today's White undergraduate students represent a unique subgroup of the White population due to the nature of their secondary socialization experiences—i.e., higher education especially on diversity/multicultural issues in the 21st century, in addition to the civil rights laws and the government—pressuring students to conform to the principles of meritocracy and equal opportunity. In addition, from a social structural approach or macro level of reality, Whites have been historically awarded the dominant racial position in the United States and as a consequence, have benefited from the distribution of social and economic resources along racial lines regardless of their multiple structural locations (men or women, working class or upper class). Furthermore, because Whites hold the dominant racial position in the United States, they would hold similar racial attitudes as Blumer's sense of racial group prejudice seems to suggest.

Summary of theoretical and conceptual issues

The first important theoretical and conceptual issue to address is to briefly discuss what the difference is between racial prejudice and racism. Up to this point, no clear distinction has been made between these two concepts. For the theoretical purposes of this dissertation, racial prejudice is defined as an intense dislike and/or feeling of resentment directed toward Blacks as a whole (Feagin et al., 1996; Pettigrew, 1997). In the literature, feelings of dislike and resentment toward Blacks have been commonly referred to as the anti-Black affect (Hughes, 1997; Sears and Henry, 2003).

Racism, on the other hand, is defined as an ideology or coherent set of beliefs of racial domination or exploitation (Bonilla-Silva, 2003). According to William J. Wilson (1973, p. 32), the ideology of racism composed of racial domination or exploitation "incorporates beliefs in a particular race's cultural and/or inherent biological inferiority and uses such beliefs to justify and prescribe inferior or unequal treatment for that group." Thus, racism is composed of affective and cognitive processes of racial prejudice.

The second important theoretical and conceptual issue to address is how interracial friendship and political conservatism could affect the impact of diversity course requirements on racial ideologies and support for race-based policy. First, through the course of interracial friendship, Whites become acquainted and sensitized to other racial and cultural experiences other than their own thereby increasing their range of reference groups. Consequently, this could have a profound impact on how Whites view Blacks relative to themselves regarding the distribution of rights, statuses, and resources. In addition, because interracial friendship emphasizes common experience, Whites could integrate Blacks into their politics of culture and identity. Hence, this study proposes that interracial friendship could moderate the

relationship between diversity course requirements and racial attitudes. One would expect the interaction to increase the effect.

Lastly, because political conservatism reflects a rigid notion of politics about governmental intervention to promote racial equality, political conservatism may thwart the diversity course requirement effect to improve racial attitudes. According to the principled conservatism perspective, Whites advocate a color-blind or race-neutral society. However, the purpose of the diversity course graduation requirement is to sensitize students to racial and cultural differences, the opposite of the ideology of political conservatism. Thus, this study proposes that political conservatism could moderate the relationship between diversity course requirements and racial attitudes. In this case, one would expect political conservatism to lessen the relationship. Having to take the diversity course may make the individual more resistant to discussions of diversity.

Hypotheses

Hypotheses 1-4 are concerned with the educational effect of diversity course graduation requirements on opposition to race-based policy, racial prejudice, and racism. Note that for the purposes of this study, racial prejudice and racism refer to both symbolic racism and laissez-faire racism (i.e., threat and classical racism).

H1. Those students who have completed the university's diversity course graduation requirements will be less likely to express racial prejudice and racism than those students who have not completed the diversity course graduation requirements.

H2. Those students who have completed the university diversity course graduation requirements will be more likely to favor race-based policy than those students who have not completed the diversity course graduation requirements.

H3. Those students who completed any single course that fulfills the diversity course requirement will be less likely to express racial prejudice and racism than those students who have not completed any single course.

H4. Those students who completed any single course that fulfills the diversity course requirement will be more likely to support race-based policy than those students who have not completed any single course.

Not only is this study concerned with how diversity courses affect racial ideologies and support for race-based policy, but also how political conservatism and interracial friendship may moderate these relationships. Thus, hypotheses 5-7 were constructed to examine the extent to which interracial friendship (hypothesis 5) and political conservatism (hypotheses 6 and 7) moderate the relationship between diversity course graduation requirements and racial attitudes. As stated before, interracial friendship emphasizes common experience between individuals who are of a different race and thus may provide Whites' with a shared sense of understanding with Blacks, for example, that allows them to integrate Blacks into their politics of culture and identity. Thus, in order to test the effect of interracial friendship on the relationship between diversity course requirements and racial ideologies, the following hypothesis was constructed:

H5. Interracial friendship will moderate the effect of the diversity course requirements on racial prejudice and racism. That is, more interracial friendship will result in increasing the diversity course effect on reducing racial prejudice and racism.

However, as aforementioned, political conservatism could have an opposite effect on the relationship between diversity course requirements and racial ideologies because the rigid nature of political conservatism is in conflict with the goals and objectives of the diversity course requirements. Thus, the following hypotheses were constructed:

H6. Political conservatism will moderate the effect of diversity course requirements on racial prejudice and racism. That is, greater political conservatism will result in lessening the diversity course effects on reducing racial prejudice and racism.

H7. Political conservatism will moderate the effect of diversity course requirements on support for race-based policy. That is, greater political conservatism will result in lessening the diversity course effect on support for race-based policy.

Since hypotheses 5-7 are interaction hypotheses, a brief definition and explanation of a moderator variable is in order. For the purposes of this study, a moderator variable is "a qualitative or quantitative variable that affects the direction and/or strength of the relationship between an independent variable and a dependent variable or criterion variable" (Baron and Kenny, 1986, p. 1174). Moderating affects are typically tested by computing an interaction term between the predictor moderator and the independent variable of interest.

As noted above, given the uniqueness of this sample of White undergraduate students, this study proposes that students are more likely to believe that the American system is fair and promote egalitarian principles and individualism rather than threat and White superiority. Thus, although both the cognitive and affective dispositions of both racial ideologies (symbolic racism and laissez-faire racism) are examined, special attention is given to the cognitive and affective dispositions of symbolic racism. Thus, it is hypothesized that:

H8. Economic individualism will predict symbolic racism in the positive direction.

H9. Anti-Black affect will predict symbolic racism in the positive direction.

H10. Egalitarianism will be negatively related to racial prejudice and racism.

H11. The strongest predictors of symbolic racism will be the strongest predictors of opposition to race-based policy.

Hypotheses 1-4 are systematically tested and evaluated with the Web survey data that were collected in the first and second study via analysis of variance (ANOVA) and t-tests in Chapter 5. Hypotheses 5-11 are also systematically tested and evaluated in Chapter 5 but with the data from the first study only using regression analysis. The data set from the first

study has a sample size that is large enough to conduct regression analysis whereas the sample size of the second study is too small to test hypotheses 5-11 using regression analysis.

CHAPTER 4: METHODOLOGY

WEB-BASED SURVEY DESIGN AS A METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION

This study is designed to identify the underlying structure of contemporary expressions of racial prejudice and racism among White undergraduate students; and to examine the educational effect of diversity course graduation requirements on the contemporary expressions of racial prejudice, racism, and opposition to race-based policy. In order to accomplish these objectives, cutting-edge survey method techniques were employed. At the dawn of the 21st century, we witnessed a significant advance in survey methodology. The Web-based survey design presents social scientists with an unprecedented method for collecting data (Dillman, 2000). The fact that every student at the university has an e-mail account and free access to the World Wide Web makes the use of a Web-based survey design for surveying students a viable option.

The data used in this study were collected during the 2001-02 academic year (i.e., fall 2001 and spring 2002 semesters) at a Midwest university using a Web survey (see Appendix A). All of the questions on racial prejudice and racism that were used in this study were obtained from the research of sociologists and psychologists who were considered to be doing cutting-edge research on the contemporary nature of racial prejudice and racism (Bobo, 2000; Demo and Hughes, 1990; Hughes, 1997; Pettigrew, 2000; Sears et al., 2000). In other words, the exact same racism and racial prejudice scales and indices that were used in past empirical studies were also adopted and used in this study but with some modifications. The reasoning behind selecting these contemporary measures of racial prejudice and racism is presented in the development of measures section. The data that

were collected in the fall 2001 semester were used to test the hypotheses of this study. The data from the second study was collected in spring 2002 using a quasi-experimental design for exploratory purposes. Data from the second study was used to examine the impact of race-based courses in particular on racial attitudes.

In developing the first sample, cooperation from the Office of the Registrar made it possible to select randomly a list of courses from a stratified list from all of the 100-400-level courses that were offered in the fall 2001 semester. Twenty-four courses participated in the first study. Of the twenty-four courses that participated, seventeen courses were selected randomly from the fall 2001 class list provided by the Office of the Registrar, and seven additional large lecture courses were selected from this class list out of convenience to maximize the response rate. Since the unit of analysis of this study was the undergraduate student, it would have been ideal if the Office of the Registrar had provided a list of all of the undergraduate students who were enrolled in the fall 2001 semester, but this was not possible due to the university's policy of confidentiality. However, because a random selection was made from all of the 100-400-level courses offered, it is believed that students who were enrolled in any of the course levels had an equal chance of participating in the study.

In addition to selecting seven additional courses to maximize the response rate, Dillman's (2000) "Tailored Design" was utilized to maximize the response rate. During the first week before classes began in the fall 2001 semester, forty-eight instructors were contacted by letter via campus mail asking them to participate in the study by distributing a "consent and participation" letter to all of their students. The letter informed the instructors of the nature and purpose of the Web-based survey and pointed out that their class time would not be interrupted for students to complete the questionnaire. The instructors also

were asked to consider offering extra-credit in addition to the cash prize to be won in a raffle drawing that already was offered to encourage full participation.

About five days after the initial mailing, instructors were contacted by telephone and e-mail to make arrangements to receive and distribute the "consent and participation letters" to their students. However, as expected, some instructors could not be reached for various reasons, some decided not to participate, and not every instructor offered extra-credit to his or her students for completing the questionnaire. Of the forty-eight instructors who were contacted, twenty-three participated in the study by distributing "consent and participation letters" to 2,816 undergraduate students during the first week of classes. In the letter, students were asked if they would like to participate by completing a questionnaire on the Internet or by filling-out a paper questionnaire that was available upon request. The letter specified that their participation was important and voluntary. Also, they were told that their participation would be confidential and their names would not be matched to their responses. In addition, the letter described the nature of the Internet survey, and provided instructions on how to complete the questionnaire either on-line or on paper (see Appendix B). Students were given two weeks to complete the questionnaire.

Out of the 2,816 students who were contacted, 1005 chose to participate in the first study. More specifically, 975 completed the questionnaire on the Internet and 30 others completed paper questionnaires. The overall response rate was 36%. However, in almost all of the courses that offered both incentives (i.e., extra-credit and cash prize), the response rate was over 50%. Because the study concerned White undergraduate students' racial attitudes towards Blacks, only the White undergraduate students' racial attitudes were examined. As a result, 127 respondents were dropped from the sample (n= 878). Furthermore, in order to

accurately assess the impact of the diversity course requirement, students who had already completed the diversity course requirement and also completed additional diversity courses were not included in the initial analysis (n= 28). Thus, the final sample for the first study consisted of 850 White undergraduate students. Those students who had already fulfilled the university's diversity graduation requirement and had taken additional diversity courses went beyond what the university required for graduation and so including them in the sample could possibly affect the results.

The university's approach to the diversity course requirement was very broad. Courses were offered campus-wide in various departments, which were approved by the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee. Students were required to complete one US diversity course and one International perspective course (i.e., two courses total) in order to have met the university's diversity course requirements for graduation. However, there were many courses that fulfilled the diversity requirements such as music appreciation, human sexuality, international languages, and religious studies that did not address issues of race and racism.

Therefore, it was necessary to conduct a second study in the spring 2002 semester that explored the impact of only race-based courses on White undergraduate students' racial attitudes. The sampling procedure for the second study was very different from the first study. For example, the sample consisted of courses that were not randomly chosen but rather conveniently selected from a list of courses that the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee had approved for meeting the university's diversity course graduation requirements. Courses that addressed race, class, and more than one racial or ethnic group in the U.S. were the focus of this study (e.g., Intro to African American studies, Sociology of Race and Ethnicity, Social Class and Inequality, and Intro to Cultural Anthropology).

A repeated (pre/post) design was employed using the same exact Internet survey instrument as in the first study to allow for a precise examination of attitude change across time (Campbell and Stanley, 1963; Marullo, 1998). The procedure used for contacting the instructors and students to participate in the second study was done the exact same way as in the first study. However, data from the pretest group were collected during the first two weeks of the course. Presumably, students would not have been exposed to the entire course's content during the first two weeks of a sixteen-week course. Data were collected again in the fourteenth-week of the semester.

Of the ten instructors who were contacted, nine participated in the second study by distributing "consent and participation letters" to 934 undergraduate students during the first week of classes. In the letter, students were asked to participate by completing a questionnaire twice (i.e., once in the beginning and once at the end of the semester) on the Internet or by filling-out a paper questionnaire that was available upon request. In order to maximize the response rate, four students were randomly selected to receive a cash prize of $50.00 each.

Past research has indicated that the pretest could influence students' responses on the posttest (Campbell and Stanley, 1963; Marullo, 1998). In other words, students who were exposed to the pretest could become sensitive or more aware of their prejudices and as result, reduce their racial prejudices due to pretest exposure rather than from being exposed to the course content. To account for this problem of internal invalidity, Campbell and Stanely (1963) introduced the *static-group comparison design* where one group would not receive the pretest. According to Marullo (1998), in order to effectively set-up the *static-group design* to test for a testing effect, about 60 percent of the course should receive the real questionnaire

and the remaining 40 percent should receive a "placebo." Thus, in order to test for a testing effect in each course, a placebo questionnaire was administered to about 40 percent of the students in each course and the remaining 60 percent received the real questionnaire. Students who received the "placebo" questionnaire were not randomly selected. When the instructor passed out the letters to his or her students in class, the letters were arranged so that every other student in the class would receive the "placebo" questionnaire. Because randomization was not the basis for selection, the results should be interpreted with extreme caution.

Of the 565 students who were contacted to complete the pretest and posttest questionnaires on the Internet, 196 chose to participate by completing the pretest. There were no students who completed the paper questionnaire. The overall response rate was 35%. However, in the five courses where the instructors did not offer extra-credit, the overall response rate was dismal (6%); and in the four remaining courses where the instructors did offer extra-credit in addition to the cash incentive, the overall response rate was 35%. Since this study only examined White racial attitudes, twenty respondents were dropped from the sample because they were not White (n= 176). Forty-four respondents were dropped because they did not complete the posttest questionnaire and four respondents were dropped because they had indicated "other" as their class classification. Thus, the final sample size of those students who completed both the pretest and posttest was 129.

Of the 369 students who were contacted to complete the placebo and posttest, 126 chose to participate by completing the placebo questionnaire. The overall response rate was 34%. However, eighteen non-White students were excluded from the sample and twenty-

three students did not complete the posttest questionnaire. Thus, the final sample size for those students who completed the placebo and posttest was 85.

Development of measures

All of the measures of racial prejudice, racism, and opposition to race-based policy (dependent variables) are intervally-scaled and coded so that a higher score reflected a higher value of the variable. In general, this means that higher scores reflect more negative views or feelings toward Blacks and greater opposition to race-based policy.

Dependent variables

The social structural approach to measuring traditional prejudice or old-fashioned racism in survey research using attitudinal items has varied widely, but Bobo and Hutchings (1996), Bobo et al. (2000), and Sidanius et al. (1996) have focused their attention on measures that have been used consistently (i.e., White feelings of superiority and outgroup threat) throughout the years but with some modification. Sidanius et al. (1996) were particularly successful in using four items that captured White feelings of superiority. In their study, students were asked to indicate the extent of their positive or negative feelings on a five-point scale ranging from 1= "very positive" to 5= "very negative" on the following hypothetical objects, statements, or events: (a) "Black supervisor," (b) "White superiority" (reversed-coded), (c)"Racial equality," and (d) "Each ethnic group should stay in its own place" (reversed-coded). Sidanius et al. (1996) combined these four-items by taking the average of them and referred to this four-item scale as *classical racism*. Sidanius et al.'s (1996) classical racism scale proved to be reliable (Cronbach's alpha = .80). Thus, in this study, the classical racism scale was used to measure White feelings of superiority (i.e., traditional racial prejudice or old-fashioned racism).

Bobo and Hutchings (1996) and Bobo et al. (2000) used four items to measure respondents' perceptions of threat or zero-sum competition for scare resources (*threat*). Respondents were asked to indicate the extent of their agreement and disagreement on a five-point scale (1= strongly disagree and 5= strongly agree) with each of the following statements: (a) "More good jobs for Blacks means fewer good jobs for members of other groups, (b) "The more influence Blacks have in local politics the less influence members of other groups will have in local politics," (c) "As more good housing and neighborhoods go to Blacks, the fewer good houses and neighborhoods there will be for members of other groups," (d) "Many Blacks have been trying to get ahead economically at the expense of other groups." All four items were combined to create a perceived threat four item-scale by taking the average of these four items. The threat index has been proven to be reliable in previous research studies (Cronbach's alpha = .77) (Bobo and Hutchings, 1996). Thus, Bobo and Hutching's (1996) four-item scale of perceived threat was used in this study to measure White students perceived threat of Blacks (*threat*).

Sears et al. (2000) have constructed social psychological measures of racial prejudice and racism that have been widely used in research studies. These social psychological items do not measure the blatant forms of racial prejudice, group conflict, or feelings of superiority, but rather, examine the more subtle forms of racial prejudice and racism. Sears and Kinder (1971) constructed a symbolic racism scale to assess the respondents' belief that racism and discrimination are in the past and the moral resentment of Blacks for violating cherished American values such as individualism and the work ethic. For the past twenty years, symbolic racism was measured with these five items: (a) "Most Blacks who receive money from welfare programs could get along without it if they tried," (b) "Irish, Italians, Jewish,

and many other minorities overcame prejudice and worked their way up, Blacks should do the same without any special favors," (c) "It's really a matter of some people not trying hard enough; if Blacks would only try harder, they could be just as well off as Whites," (d) "Over the past few years, Blacks have gotten less than they deserve," and (e) "Generations of slavery and discrimination have created conditions that make it difficult for Blacks to work their way out of the lower class." (Sears et al., 2000; Hughes, 1997) Each item used a five-point scale ranging from 1= "strongly disagree" to 5= "strongly agree." The symbolic racism index was constructed by taking the average of these five items. All five items were used in previous research and can be found in the 1988, 1990, and 1992 American National Election Survey (ANES) (Hughes, 1997). The symbolic racism index had proven to be reliable in the ANES studies (Cronbach's alpha = .72, .76, and .75, respectively) (Hughes, 1997). Thus, this study used the symbolic racism scale (*symracef*) to measure undergraduate students' moral resentment of Blacks violating cherished American values.

Past research studies have revealed that while the college-educated were likely to promote racial equality and racial integration, they were not in support of governmental policy to bring about equality and integration (Bobo and Kluegal, 1993; Jackman and Muha, 1984). In fact, Bobo and Kluegal (1993, p. 447) argued, "...that [Whites'] opposition to race-targeted policy is more strongly based on anti-black attitudes...". Furthermore, although empirical studies do report a decline in racial prejudice over the last 50 years or so, racial antipathy lingers and can be expressed in more subtle ways (Chang, 2001; Hughes, 1997; Jackman & Muha, 1984). To attempt to capture this dimension of racial attitudes in this study, the following three-items were used to measure respondents' support for race-targeted policy that provide opportunities for Blacks: (a) "Giving business and industry

special tax breaks for locating in largely Black areas," (b) "Spending more money on schools in Black neighborhoods, especially for pre-school and early education programs," and (c)"Provide special college scholarships for Black children who maintain good grades." Each item used a five-point scale ranging from 1= "strongly favor" to 5= "strongly oppose" to measure students' support for race-targeted policy. These three-items were taken from the 1991 General Social Survey. Bobo and Kluegal (1993) used these three-items to measure opposition to race-targeted policy but they did not report the Cronbach's alpha for this scale.

Past research shows that the dependent measures of racial prejudice and racism are empirically distinct and reliable constructs. However, the reliabilities of these dependent measures can change as result of so many factors (e.g., sampling and methods of data collection). Thus, a factor analysis and reliability analyses are reported in the results chapter to check if these dependent measures of racial prejudice and racism are empirically distinct and reliable.

Independent variables

The independent variables include two sets of predictors of racial prejudice, racism, and opposition to race-based policy. The first set included basic socio-demographic variables such as gender, father's highest level of educational attainment, parent's annual income, interracial contact while growing up (i.e., White racial composition), number of interracial friendships before entering college, and population size of hometown. The second set of predictor variables consists of political values and racial attitudes with the exception of diversity course exposure (see Appendix C for variable construction).

The diversity course requirement measure consisted of two parts. In the first part, students were asked if they had met the diversity course requirement. If they answered

"yes," then students specified the type of courses (i.e., US diversity and International Perspectives) they completed for fulfilling the diversity graduation requirement. If they answered "no" then students were directed to the second part that asked them if they had completed only one diversity course (either US diversity or International Perspectives) that counted towards meeting the diversity graduation requirements. If students answered "yes" to either completing a US diversity or International Perspectives course, they were also asked to specify the type of course completed. If students could not find their course listed as a response category, they could type the name of the course in the space provided in the Internet questionnaire.

One of the strongest predictors of symbolic racism noted in the research is the belief in economic individualism (Hughes, 1997; Sears et al., 2000). That is, belief in the traditional American values of hard work and equal opportunity for all acts as a precursor to symbolic racism and opposition to policy designed to promote racial equality. Therefore, economic individualism is another independent variable that is considered in this study to see if there is in fact a positive association between economic individualism and symbolic racism as past research seems to suggest (Hughes, 1997; Sears et al., 2000). Economic individualism (*indvlism*) was a single-item measure that used a five-point agree/disagree scale to indicate students' endorsement of the statement: "America is a land of opportunity in which you need only to work hard to succeed."

Egalitarianism (*egalitar*) is another predictor of the social psychological approach to racial prejudice and racism. Egalitarianism is the belief in the core ideals of the American Creed: that all citizens should have equal opportunity to succeed and that no American should be discriminated against because of nationality, creed, religion, race, etc. (Hughes,

1997; Sears et al., 2000). Past research has not only shown that egalitarianism had strong independent negative effects on symbolic racism but also was negatively associated with old-fashioned prejudice (Hughes, 1997). Thus, egalitarianism is included in this study to see if there is in fact not only a negative relationship between symbolic racism and egalitarianism but also between egalitarianism and threat and egalitarianism and classical racism (Hughes, 1997).

Egalitarianism was measured with these six items: (a) "Our society should do whatever is necessary to make sure that everyone has an equal opportunity to succeed." (b) "We have gone too far in pushing equal rights in this country." (c) "One of the big problems in this country is that we don't give everyone an equal chance." (d) "This country would be better off if we worried less about how equal people are." (e) "It is not really that big of a problem if some people have more of a chance in life than others." (f) "If people were treated more equally in this country, we would have many fewer problems.

Each item used a five-point scale ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree" to measure the student's belief in the abstract principle of equality. Items 2(b), 4(d), & 5(e) were reverse-coded so that a high score indicated egalitarianism. All six items were used in previous research and can be found in the 1992 American National Election Survey (ANES) (Hughes, 1997). Previous studies have shown that this six-item scale has been reliable (Cronbach alphas for this index are .65, .60, and .71 for the 1988, 1990, and 1992 ANES, respectively) (Hughes, 1997).

Measures of affective prejudice and negative stereotypes will not only be used to predict threat, classical racism, and opposition to race-based policy but also to capture the anti-Black affect of symbolic racism (Williams et al., 1999). Pettigrew (2000, 1997) created

the affective prejudice measure that captures the absence of positive emotion of the dominant group towards the out-group. A five-point scale was used to ascertain the frequency (1= "very often" to 5= "never") with which respondents specified that they felt (a) lack of sympathy and (b) lack of admiration of a particular out-group. The affective prejudice measure was constructed by taking the average of these two items. Pettigrew's measure of affective prejudice had proven to be a reliable construct (Cronbach's alpha = .69) and so this study used Pettigrew's affective prejudice scale (*aprej*) to measure the absence of positive emotion of White students toward Blacks.

Negative stereotyping of Blacks has shown to be a strong predictor of racial prejudice and racism in empirical research (Bobo and Kluegal, 1997; Hughes, 1997; Sears et al., 1997). White racial attitudes have expressed that Blacks lack certain positively valued traits compared to Whites (e.g., hard working, self-supporting, non-violent) (Bobo, 2000; Bobo and Kluegal, 1997). In these studies, stereotypes of Whites and Blacks were measured by five bi-polar 1- to 7 trait-rating scales. Respondents were asked to indicate where Blacks and Whites fall along each of the following scales of opposites: 1= hard working to 7= lazy, 1= not violence-prone to 7= violence-prone, 1= intelligent to 7= unintelligent, 1= self supporting to 7= live off welfare, and 1= patriotic to 7= unpatriotic (GSS, 1991). The Cronbach's alpha reliability was .75 for Black stereotypes (Bobo and Kluegal, 1997). However, for the purposes of this study, all measures were reversed coded so that, a high positive score indicates a positively valued trait for Whites (*wstype*) and Blacks (*bstype*). The negative stereotype index (*negstype*) was constructed by taking the average of all items and then subtracting the average rating score for *bystype* from the respective rating score for *wstype* (trait ratings difference). A positive score indicates that a student perceives that a valued trait

is found more often among Whites, and a negative score indicates that Blacks possess the valued trait more so than Whites.

Pettigrew's measure of diverse friendships was composed of two different categories: race and nationality. In this study, students were asked, (a) "Before you came to college, indicate how many friends you had who are of a different race (e.g., African American, Asian American); (b) "Before you... how many of a different nationality." Response categories for the race and nationality items were the same, and the range was from "zero" to "four or more" meaning that (0) "zero" is no diverse friendships and (4)"four or more" indicates having at least four diverse friendships. Since this study focuses on White racial attitudes toward Blacks, only the response category for number of friends who are of a different race was used to measure the number of interracial friendships the respondents had before coming to college. Originally, Pettigrew and Meerten (1995) combined the racial and nationality categories and their scale was set up so that the respondents reported if they had "many" (two points), "a few" (one point), or "no friends" (no points). High scorers report highly diverse friends.

A related measure is interracial contact or white racial composition (*dcontact*). It is obvious to state that the more interracial contact a student has had the more likely he or she will have formed interracial friendships. However, what's not so obvious is how frequent interracial contact occurs throughout one's life. *Dcontact* indicates the level of interracial contact that the student has had throughout his or her life. Originally, in their study, Demo and Hughes (1990) had developed an interracial contact scale to measure how much interracial contact Blacks had with Whites. Cronbach's alpha was not reported for this scale. However, for the purposes of this study, Demo and Hughes' (1990) scale was slightly

modified to measure the reverse (i.e., how much interracial contact Whites had experienced with non-Whites while growing up). Students were asked to indicate their level of contact in eight social settings: 1) grammar or elementary school, 2) junior high school, 3) high school, 4) college, 5) neighborhood while growing up, 6) present neighborhood, 7) church or place of worship usually attended, 8) present workplace, if employed. Responses were coded as follows 1 = All non-Whites, 2 = Mostly non-Whites, 3 = about half non-Whites, 4 = Mostly Whites, 5 = Almost all Whites, and 6= Never in social setting. For those students who did not experience any of the eight social setting categories specified, the response category "Never in social setting" was added and coded as a 6.

The interracial contact measure was constructed by taking the average of only 7 of the social setting items. Since the purpose of the interracial contact scale was to measure how much interracial contact respondents have had while growing up, the college setting was not included in the data analysis. It is important to point out that the response category "Never in social setting" was not meant to be part of the scale and thus was treated as missing data. The mean score was 4.43 with "Never in social setting" treated as missing data. However, treating "Never in social setting" as missing data in each social setting resulted in a total of 236 missing values. In order to avoid this substantial loss of data, the variable mean score of 4.43 was used to replace the missing values. Replacing the missing values with the variable mean recovered the 236 missing values without changing the overall mean score for interracial contact. The outcome of this measure indicates how diverse the interracial contact or racial composition was for respondents while growing up.

In past studies, political conservatism was measured on a seven-point scale ranging from "1= extremely liberal to 7= extremely conservative." Respondents were asked, "Where

would you place yourself on this scale?" (GSS, 1991; Sidanius et al., 1996). This political conservatism measure (*polorien*) was used in this study to capture the non-racial explanation for not supporting race-based policy and to examine its moderating effect on the relationship between diversity course graduation requirements and racial prejudice/racism.

For a more thorough illustration of how the questions for each variable are worded and how the independent and dependent variables are coded, see Appendix C.

Chapter 5: RESULTS

The data used in the first study were collected at a Midwest university in the fall 2001 semester using a Web-based survey design and paper questionnaires. The racial composition of the first sample was as follows: 88% identified themselves as White, 2% African American, 1.1% Hispanic (e.g., Spanish, Mexican), 6.6% Asian American/Pacific Islander, 1.8% "Other," and .6% did not respond. Because the study concerned Whites' racial attitudes toward Blacks, only the White undergraduate students' racial attitudes were examined. The final sample for this analysis was 850 White undergraduate students. Four hundred fifty-nine of the participants were women (54%) and 391 were men (46%).

Over two-thirds of the participants came from small towns and rural areas (e.g., 38.8% came from small towns and 29.3% came from a rural area). The racial composition that participants experienced while growing up was mostly White (M= 4.43). The sample had a mean age of 20.8 years, with a range from 18 to 44 years. 38.6% of the respondents were seniors, followed by freshmen (25.8%), juniors (21.3%), and sophomores (14.4%). Just over half of the respondents (51.6%) did not complete any of the diversity course requirements, followed by (21.2%) of the respondents who completed a single diversity course, and (27.2%) who met the diversity graduation requirement (i.e., completed one U.S. course and one International Perspectives course).

The first task was to confirm and identify the underlying structure of the racial prejudice and racism scales. That is, locating any overlapping indicators, and empirically demonstrating the extent to which the social structural and social psychological measures constitute separate dimensions that can be differentiated as was demonstrated in prior research (Hughes, 1997). In order to accomplish this task, a confirmatory factor analysis

using maximum likelihood estimation and oblique rotation were performed on all of the dependent measures of racial prejudice and racism to develop and confirm multi-item indices of racial prejudice and racism. Oblique rotation was used because measures of racial prejudice and racism used in this study are correlated. Even though the dependent measures of racial prejudice and racism are correlated, oblique rotation creates separate dimensions that can be empirically differentiated. Ideally, the intent is to develop the simplest structure with the least correlation among factors. After the underlying structure of racial attitudes was identified, One-Way ANOVA, independent samples and paired t-tests were used to examine whether there was an effect of diversity course graduation requirements on racial attitudes in the hypothesized directions as specified in this study.

Lastly, regression analysis was performed to test the interaction hypotheses and to estimate the strength of the effect of each of the socio-demographic characteristics, racial and political attitudes in predicting opposition to race-based policy, racial prejudice and racism. More specifically, stepwise regression was utilized to develop the most parsimonious models to predict opposition to race-based policy, racial prejudice and racism. The stepwise selection process deletes those predictors that fail to meet the statistical criteria needed to substantially contribute to the prediction of opposition to race-based policy, racial prejudice and racism.

Table 1 presents the results of the factor analysis. In addition, because oblique (oblimin) rotation is used, the correlations among factors are also presented (Nicol and Pexman, 1999). The results of the factor correlation matrix do indeed show that the factors are correlated. The largest correlation among factors is between factor 2 and factor 5 (.488), followed by factor 3 and 5 (.444), and factor 1 and 4 (.418). Five factors emerged. All

factor loadings that were considered to be strong or high loadings were ≥ .40. In addition, Cronbach alphas were calculated to check on the reliability of these items that yielded high loadings in the factor analysis. Based on the results of this factor analysis, five scales were created to measure White racial attitudes.

Table 1. Factor Loadings for Opposition to Race-Based Policy, Racial Prejudice and Racism Items: Oblimin Rotation

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
1. More influence of Blacks in local politics...	**.911**				
2. More good housing for Blacks...	**.862**				
3. More good jobs for Blacks...	**.805**				
4. Blacks trying to get ahead...	**.563**				
5. Blacks got less than they deserve...*		**.941**			
6. Generations of slavery and discrimination...*		**.489**			
7. Irish...overcame prejudice, Blacks...			**.755**		
8. If Blacks would try harder...			**.727**		
9. Blacks could get along without welfare...			**.685**		
10. White superiority*				**.737**	
11. Each ethnic group should stay...*				**.685**	
12. Provide special college scholarships for Blacks...					**.738**
13. Spending more money on schools in Black neighborhoods...					**.673**
14. Giving business and industry special tax Breaks...					**.417**
Factor Correlations					
Factor 1	--				
Factor 2	.181	--			
Factor 3	.375	.272	--		
Factor 4	.418	.158	.253	--	
Factor 5	.305	.488	.444	.201	--

Note. Boldface indicates significant factor loadings.
Items indicated here are with abbreviated descriptions. See questionnaire for the full wording of each item.
*Direction of item was reversed before analysis

The first factor consists of four-items ("Blacks in local politics," "More good housing for Blacks," "More good jobs for Blacks," and "Blacks trying to get ahead economically"). In past research, all four-items, measure a social structural approach/traditional racial prejudice and reflect endorsement of threat or zero-sum competition for scarce resources. Cronbach's alpha reliability for this four-item index is .87. Note that this Cronbach alpha is much higher than what was found in prior research (α= .77) (Bobo and Hutchings, 1996). Thus, the results of the factor analysis and reliability analysis indicate that this four-item scale is an empirically supported construct to measure respondents' perceived threat of Blacks (Bobo and Hutchings, 1996). Based on these findings, a four-item scale was constructed that took the average of the same four items that were used in past research to serve as an indicator of perceived threat in this study.

The second factor is surprising. Only two items of symbolic racism, "Blacks got less than they deserve..." (.941) and "Generations of slavery and discrimination..." (.489) converged on a single factor. This is an interesting finding because these two items of symbolic racism seem to shift the focus away from Blacks violating cherished American values such as the work ethic to focus more on stratification beliefs (i.e., structural explanations for why Blacks end up in higher or lower socio-economic positions in society). In fact, symbolic racism research has been criticized for not only taping resentment of Blacks, but also stratification beliefs and policy attitudes about affirmative action (Hughes, 1997; Sears et al., 1997). Given this criticism of content overlap, the original five-item symbolic racism measure is called into questioned in this study. A reliability analysis of these two items of symbolic racism yielded a .64 Cronbach's alpha, which is a moderately reliable empirical construct to measure Whites' stratification beliefs. Based on this finding, a

two-item scale was constructed that took the average of the two items to serve as an indicator of Whites' stratification beliefs in this study.

The stratification beliefs measure could possibly tap whether or not White undergraduate students believe that racism and racial discrimination are in the past. Furthermore, because this new stratification beliefs measure was originally part of the symbolic racism scale, this study treats this new stratification beliefs measure as another form of racial prejudice. Recall that the problem of prejudice begins when the standards of one's own group is used to compare the self to another group (Jones, 1972). Because of racial residential segregation, Whites are not consciously aware of how their racial status impacts Blacks and thus there is a tendency for Whites to believe that the stratification system is fair and they have little reason to ask if the system works. However, this study proposes that being exposed to diversity course graduation requirements could help make students aware of the structural dynamics that reproduce racial inequality. Thus, in accordance with hypotheses 1-4, the following hypotheses were constructed:

H12. Those students who completed any single diversity course requirement will more likely believe that structural barriers do exist that prevent Blacks from making progress.

H13. Those students who completed the university's diversity course graduation requirement will more likely believe that structural barriers do exist that prevent Blacks from making progress.

In addition, a related measure is egalitarianism. Recall that egalitarianism measures the extent to which students believe that society is responsible for ensuring equal opportunity for all. As previously mentioned, past research found that egalitarianism had strong independent negative effects on symbolic racism (Hughes, 1997; Sears et al., 2000). Based on this finding, Sears et al. (2000) concluded that these strong negative effects of

egalitarianism on symbolic racism call into question the extent to which Whites' believe society is responsible for creating equal opportunities for Blacks. In fact, Sears et al. (2000) purported that their findings show that efforts to increase racial equality may be construed by Whites as violating the fundamental individualistic principle of meritocracy. However, since these past findings are based on the original five-item symbolic racism scale that mixes Whites' perceptions of the opportunity structure for Blacks and their resentment of Blacks for not trying hard enough, there is no specific assessment on what Whites think about the opportunity structure for Blacks in general. In other words, in order to effectively address Sears et al.'s (2000) conclusion, it is important to specifically address the extent to which Whites believe that the opportunity structure is fair for Blacks.

Furthermore, as noted above the theoretical driving force behind the problem of racial prejudice in this study begins with Whites having different socialization experiences due to racial residential segregation. Because Whites do not recognize and experience race as a central part of their socialization experiences, there's a tendency for Whites to believe that one's racial background does not get in the way of one's efforts in making social and economic progress. The belief that "we are all equal" has been embraced by the American public ever since the passing of the civil rights era, but because of racial residential segregation, Whites are only passively accepting values like equality without questioning their own biases about how the stratification system operates. If this is the case, consistent with the findings of past research, this study hypothesizes that egalitarianism will be negatively related to stratification beliefs (Hughes, 1997; Sears et al., 2000). Hence, an additional hypothesis was constructed:

H14. Egalitarianism negatively predicts stratification beliefs. That is, those students who believe in the abstract principle of equality are less likely to believe that the opportunity structure is fair and free from structural conditions hindering Blacks from making progress.

The third factor shows that the three items, "Irish...overcame prejudice" (.755), "if Blacks would try harder" (.727), and "Blacks could get along without welfare" (.685) factor together for symbolic racism instead of five indicators. The bivariate correlations between these three items and the two dropped items, "Over the past few years..." (.15, .17, and .10 respectively) and Generations of slavery..." (.16, 15, and .13 respectively) are extremely low. In comparison, the bivariate correlations among these three items that factor together were all $\geq .50$. In addition, the Cronbach alpha for the original five-item scale was .67 whereas the newly created three-item scale yielded a Cronbach alpha reliability of .77. It appears that these three items combined are more reliable in measuring symbolic racism than the original five-item scale. Based on these findings, a three-item scale was constructed that took the average of the three items to serve as an indicator of symbolic racism in this study.

In the fourth factor, two items of classical racism scale converged, "White superiority" and "Each ethnic group should stay in its own place." It is important to mention that results of the initial factor analysis had indicated that all four items of the classical racism scale did not converge together on a single factor. In particular, the results of the initial factor analysis in the Table in Appendix D show that Black supervisor with an unusually high factor loading (1.019) converged with racial equality (.346) on a single factor. As a result of this finding, an item analysis was conducted to check the reliability of the original classical racism four-item scale. Without the two items, "Black supervisor" and "Racial equality" the reliability analysis yielded a .70 Cronbach's alpha in comparison to the

original four-item classical racism scale (Cronbach's alpha= .66). In addition, when only one item "Racial equality" was dropped from the four-item scale, Cronbach's alpha was .53. Based on these findings, the classical racism scale was re-constructed to consist of the average of "White superiority" and "Each ethnic group should stay..." to measure classical racism.

In the fifth factor, all three opposition to race-based policy indicators loaded together ("Giving business and industry...", "Spending more money...", and "Provide special college scholarships...") on a single factor. As a result of this finding, an item analysis was conducted to check the reliability of the three-item opposition to race-based policy scale. The reliability analysis yielded a .68 Cronbach's alpha, which is an empirically reliable construct with which to measure opposition to race-based policy.

The results of the factor analysis in Table 1 and the reliability analyses show that the dependent variables (opposition to race-based policy, the social structural and social psychological measures of racial prejudice and racism) are reliable measures that can be empirically differentiated as demonstrated in prior research with the exception of two symbolic racism items. However, the factor analysis results show that the 3 items of symbolic racism that factor together tap the essential requisite for symbolic racism to occur and that is, Blacks violate cherished American values such as individualism and the work ethic by "not trying hard" enough. The other two original items of symbolic racism, on the other hand, factor together on a single factor to reveal White stratification beliefs of Blacks (e.g. structural conditions exist that make it difficult for Blacks to achieve success).

The mean scores and standard deviations for opposition to race-based policy and each of the social structural and social psychological measures of racial prejudice/racism and their

predictors are reported in Table 2. The new variable, stratification beliefs, is also included. Opposition to raced-based policy and all of the social structural and social psychological measures of racial prejudice/racism were measured using a five-point Likert scale format. The higher the mean scores for each of these racial prejudice and racism measures, the greater the racism and/or racial prejudice.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Dependent variables and Predictors of Political and Racial attitudes

	Variable	N	M	SD
Dependent	Stratification beliefs	850	3.16	.83
	Race-based policy	850	3.06	.68
	Symbolic racism	850	3.00	.79
	Threat	850	2.10	.73
	Classic racism	850	1.73	.88
Independent	Egalitarianism	850	3.37	.63
	Economic individualism	848	3.32	1.15
	Affective prejudice	850	2.68	.74
	Political conservatism	850	4.00	1.24
	Interracial friendships	840	2.20	1.53
	White racial composition	850	4.43	.57
	Negative stereotypes	850	.43	.61

Note. All dependent measures were measured on a 5-point scale. For the independent variables, Political conservatism was measured on a 7-point scale, Negative stereotypes were measured on a 7-point scale, and Interracial friendship was measured on a scale from 0 to 4. All other Independent variables were measured on a 5-point scale.

The highest mean score is stratification beliefs (3.16), followed by opposition to race-based policy (3.06) and then symbolic racism (3.00). Although the mean score for affective prejudice is 2.68, affective prejudice is positively correlated with symbolic racism ($r = .253$, $p \leq .001$) (see Table 3a). However, what is most interesting is that the positive correlation between negative stereotypes and symbolic racism is a bit stronger ($r = .279, p \leq .001$) (see Table 3b).

Table 3a. Correlations among contemporary measures of racial prejudice and predictor variables (N = 850)

Variable Name	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Symbolic racism	—	.352***	.204***	.253***	.015	.400***	-.327***	.140***	.201***	-.036	.069*	.024
2. Race-based policy		—	.374***	.316***	-.053	.124***	-.372***	.093**	.127***	-.050	.072*	.027
3. Stratification beliefs			—	.204***	.041	.125***	-.440***	.119***	.098**	-.041	-.034	-.014
4. Affective prejudice				—	.036	.083*	-.353***	.164***	.096**	-.050	.052	-.031
5. Diversity course exposure					—	.015	-.079*	.075*	.056	-.060	.043	-.023
6. Economic individualism						—	-.072*	.036	.082	-.038	.038	.043
7. Egalitarianism							—	-.231***	-.226**	.097**	-.029	.021
8. Gender								—	.092**	.015	-.012	-.091**
9. Political conservatism									—	-.035	-.001	.052
10. Interracial friendship										—	-.113***	-.094**
11. White racial composition											—	.188***
12. Rural												—

*p≤.05 **p≤.01 ***p≤.001 (2-tailed)

Table 3b. Correlations among contemporary measures of racial prejudice and predictor variables (N = 850)

Variable Name	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13. Classic	.224***	.179***	.154***	.205***	-.066	.081*	-.290***	.058	.123***	-.047	.010	.050
14. Threat	.334***	.280***	.172***	.263***	.028	.061	-.338***	.164***	.146***	-.066	.012	.063
15. Negative stereotypes	.279***	.128***	.129***	.244***	.028	.035	-.170***	.042	.098**	-.041	.075*	-.084*
16. Income (parents')	-.005	.039	.054	.066	.105**	.023	-.095**	.117***	.055	.068	.027	-.250***
17. Less high school (father)	-.058	-.069*	-.045	-.049	-.026	.010	.087*	-.050	-.015	-.015	-.005	.002
18. High school	.050	.033	.029	.064	-.047	-.036	-.001	-.068*	-.032	-.072*	.023	.111***
19. College degree	.014	.020	.017	-.064	.028	-.007	-.015	.049	-.008	.029	.030	-.034
20. Graduate degree	-.061	-.046	-.052	.019	.044	.065	-.014	.056	.066	.074*	-.071*	-.115***
21. Small city	.005	.037	-.024	-.018	-.003	-.001	-.001	.001	-.001	-.046	-.011	-.513***
22. Metropolitan	-.004	-.003	.051	.064	.064	-.020	-.050	.123***	-.029	.034	-.164***	-.317***

*p≤.05 **p≤.01 ***p≤.001 (2-tailed)

Table 3c. Correlations among contemporary measures of racial prejudice and predictor variables (N = 850)

Variable Name	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
13. Classic	—	.372***	.223***	.010	-.045	.034	-.024	-.001	.004	-.022
14. Threat		—	.266***	-.010	-.017	.061	-.001	-.081*	.008	-.026
15. Negative stereotypes			—	.064	-.036	-.003	.037	-.030	.011	.005
16. Income (parents')				—	-.231***	-.237***	.152***	.232***	.045	.106**
17. Less high school (father)					—	-.147***	-.119***	-.061	.020	.002
18. High school						—	-725***	-.370***	.031	-.085*
19. College degree							—	-.300***	-.011	.009
20. Graduate degree								—	-.035	.113***
21. Small city									—	-.392***
22. Metropolitan										—

*p≤.05 **p≤.01 ***p≤.001 (2-tailed)

This is a significant finding because the attitudinal origins of symbolic racism lie in a blend of anti-Black affect and economic individualism (Hughes, 1997; Sears et al., 1997). Sears et al. (2000) concluded in their study that anti-Black affect significantly influences Whites' support for race-based policy. In another study, Williams and his associates (1999) found that Whites who reported that they seldom felt sympathy and admiration (i.e., affective prejudice) for Blacks were more likely to oppose race-targeted polices to eradicate racial inequality.

In support of Williams et al.'s (1999) findings, Table 3a shows that affective prejudice is positively correlated with opposition to race-based policy ($r = .316, p \leq .001$) and stratification beliefs ($r = .204, p \leq .001$). However, since correlation does not mean causation, a closer examination of students' positive emotions for Blacks is warranted. Upon further examination of the data, a substantial proportion of students in this sample did not often feel positive emotions for Blacks, thereby capturing an anti-Black affect. Sixty-four percent indicated that they seldom (not too often, hardly ever, never) felt sympathy for Blacks, and 52 percent indicated that they seldom felt admiration. Capturing the anti-Black affect enables this study to deal with the complexities of the origins of symbolic racism and that is, attempting to highlight the resentment that Whites feel toward Blacks because they feel that Blacks simply are not working hard enough to get ahead. In addition, the significant positive correlation between affective prejudice and stratification beliefs could possibly indicate that those students who seldom feel sympathy and admiration for Blacks are more likely to believe that racial discrimination and racism are in the past.

As shown in Table 2, the mean score for threat (2.10) is low and the classical racism score (1.73) is the lowest as expected. As previously mentioned, prior research has shown

that old-fashioned racism among Whites has declined, but support for race-based policy to reduce racial inequality has not increased. One of the reasons for this according to Bobo and his associates (1997) is that negative stereotypes still persist and are key dimensions of racial prejudice. In support of Bobo et al.'s (1997) argument on the persistence of negative stereotypes, the difference between the mean levels of Whites' perceptions of themselves (wstype) (M= 4.90) and their perceptions of Blacks (bstype) (M= 4.47) was found to be statistically significant t(850)= 20.652, $p \leq .001$. These mean differences show a marked tendency for White undergraduate students to rate themselves in a more favorable light using the bipolar trait-rating scales. These bipolar trait-ratings are most evident in the cases of preferring to live off welfare or to be self-supporting, and violent-prone or nonviolent-prone. In the former case, wstype was 4.94 and bstype = 4.19 t(847) = 20.36, and for the latter case, wstype was 4.25 and bstype was 3.60 t(846) = 18.95. These bipolar trait-ratings suggest that Whites students perceive that Blacks are more likely to live off welfare and are more violent-prone than Whites. The reliability analysis yielded a .72 Chronbach's alpha for Black stereotypes and a .76 Chronbach's alpha for White stereotypes.

Consistent with previous research, although students rejected old-fashioned racist beliefs, there is a tendency to harbor negative stereotypes of Blacks and to express racial prejudice in more subtle ways (Bobo et al., 1997; Sears et al., 2000). Therefore, based on these findings in the factor analysis and the mean levels of racial attitudes and their predictors, a closer examination is warranted to unravel the complexities behind what predicts symbolic racism, opposition to race-based policy, classical racism, and threat. In addition, the stratification beliefs measure will also be used to uncover the predictors that

explain the extent to which White undergraduate students believe that racial discrimination does not exist.

The data so far seem to suggest that the underlying structure of racial prejudice among students reflects a tendency to believe that racism and discrimination are in the past and that Blacks violate traditional American values such as economic individualism. If this is the case, then it is not surprising to find that egalitarianism and economic individualism are both strongly related to symbolic racism. Table 3a reveals that there is a very strong significant positive correlation between economic individualism and symbolic racism (r = .400, $p \leq .001$) and egalitarianism is negatively correlated with symbolic racism (r = -.327, $p \leq .001$). The positive significant correlation between economic individualism and symbolic racism indicates that students may have a tendency to believe that since America is the land of opportunity where everyone has an equal opportunity to succeed, then Blacks in America should have an equal opportunity just like everyone else to succeed without preferential treatment.

However, the significant negative correlation between egalitarianism and symbolic racism could suggest that those students who believe that society has the responsibility to ensure that everyone has an equal opportunity to succeed, the more likely they believe that hard work alone does not guarantee success for Blacks. This could explain the strong negative correlation between egalitarianism and opposition to race-targeted policy (r = -.372, $p \leq .001$). That is, the more students believe that society has the responsibility to create equal opportunities for Blacks, the less likely they will oppose race-based policy that create such opportunities for Blacks. In fact, the strongest negative correlation is between egalitarianism and stratification beliefs (r = -.440 $p \leq .001$) meaning that those students who are more

egalitarian in their thinking are less likely to believe that racism and racial discrimination do not exist. However, the strong negative correlation between affective prejudice and egalitarianism may indicate that those students who do not feel sympathetic toward Blacks are less inclined to think society has the responsibility to create equal opportunity for them to succeed ($r = -.353, p \leq .001$).

Table 3a shows that there is a slight gender effect, in that women may not be as prejudiced (i.e., symbolic racism, stratification beliefs, and affective prejudice) as men ($r = .140, .119, .164, p \leq .001$) respectively and are more egalitarian in their thinking ($r = -.231, p \leq .001$). Note that gender was coded as female= 0 and male= 1. However, Table 3a also shows that political conservatism is positively correlated with symbolic racism ($r = .201$ $p \leq .001$). This could mean that students who are more conservative in their political orientation will more likely exhibit symbolic racism (i.e., express resentment towards Blacks for making illegitimate demands on the racial status quo). This correlational finding is interesting because it seems to suggest that political conservatism may not be independent of symbolic racism and if this is the case then there is the possibility to question political conservatism as a non-racial explanation for Whites not supporting race-based policy.

Furthermore, political conservatism is negatively correlated with egalitarianism ($r = -.226$ $p \leq .001$) meaning that students who are more conservative in their political orientation are less likely to believe that America has a racial inequality problem that needs to be addressed. In fact, although not as statistically significant, political conservatism is positively correlated with stratification beliefs ($r = .098$ $p \leq .01$) and affective prejudice ($r = .096$ $p \leq .01$). These correlational findings could possibly suggest that students who are more conservative in their political orientation are more likely to believe that racial discrimination

does not exist to prevent Blacks from making socio-economic progress. Consequently, there is no reason to feel sympathy towards Blacks because racial discrimination is not a problem. Given these findings, then it is not surprising to see that political conservatism is positively correlated with opposition to race-based policy ($r = .127\ p \leq .001$).

Table 3a also shows that the number of interracial friendships before entering college is negatively correlated with White racial composition ($r = -.113\ p \leq .001$). This correlational finding seems logical in that those students who come from predominantly or mostly White communities would have fewer interracial friendships. Furthermore, although the correlation is not as strong, students coming from rural areas also have fewer interracial friendships ($r = -.094\ p \leq .01$). Indeed, students from rural areas come from mostly white communities ($r = .188\ p \leq .001$). On the other hand, students coming from metropolitan areas are more likely to experience interracial contact or more racial diversity while growing up given the negative correlation between metropolitan and white racial composition ($r = -.164\ p \leq .001$). However, it is interesting to point out that the correlation between interracial friendship and metropolitan is not significant meaning that although students are coming from more racially diverse areas, they are not forming more interracial friendships. Furthermore, the positive correlation between interracial friendship and egalitarianism may suggest that those who have more interracial friendships are more likely to believe that society has the responsibility to ensure that everyone has an equal opportunity to succeed ($r = .097\ p \leq .05$). However, it is also surprising to note that the negative correlations between interracial friendship and affective prejudice, and interracial friendship and negative stereotypes are not significant thereby suggesting that interracial friendship may not affect affective prejudice and negative stereotypes.

As shown in Table 3a, the correlations between diversity course requirement exposure and the contemporary racial prejudice measures (i.e., symbolic racism, race-based policy, and stratification beliefs) are too weak (r = .015, -.053, .041 respectively). In addition, the correlations between diversity course requirement exposure and old-fashioned racial prejudice measures (i.e., classic racism and threat) are also not significant (r = -.066 and .028 respectively). Thus, none of these correlations support the hypotheses of this study (H1-H4, H12 and H13) that hypothesize that those students who have completed one to no more than two diversity course requirements will be less likely to express racial prejudice and racism and will support race-based policy. However, these correlational findings do not indicate if there are significant differences in the mean levels of contemporary and classic racism and racial prejudice exhibited between those students who did not complete any diversity course requirements and those who did have diversity course requirement exposure. To address this issue, a series of analyses were completed. First, a One-Way ANOVA was conducted to check to see if there are significant differences between those students with no diversity course exposure and those students who completed up to two diversity courses on their mean levels of racial prejudice and racism. Table 4 presents the results of the One-Way ANOVA. As Table 4 indicates, the mean levels of racial prejudice and racism do not differ significantly by the number of diversity courses completed and so the One-Way ANOVA results do not provide qualified support of hypotheses that are concerned with the educational effect of diversity course graduation requirements on opposition to race-based policy, racial prejudice and racism (H1-H4, H12 and 13) of this study.

Table 4. Means, Standard Deviations, and One-Way Analyses of Variance (ANOVAs) for Effects of Number of Diversity Courses Completed on Five Measures of Racial Prejudice and Racism

	Number of Diversity Courses Completed						
	0 (n= 439)		1 (n= 180)		2 (n= 231)		ANOVA
Variable	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	F (2, 847)
Stratification beliefs	3.13	.82	3.15	.81	3.23	.85	1.29
Symbolic Racism	2.91	.76	2.94	.78	2.93	.84	.095
Race-based policy	3.03	.79	2.94	.79	2.95	.81	1.19
Threat	2.08	.71	2.08	.71	2.16	.77	.850
Classical racism	1.78	.88	1.67	.87	1.66	.87	1.83

*p≤.05 **p≤.01 ***p≤.001

Note. Two diversity courses completed indicates fulfillment of the diversity course graduation requirement

To examine this relationship further using t-tests and regression analysis, the diversity course requirement variable was collapsed into two categories (i.e., 0= no diversity course exposure and 1= diversity course exposure). Collapsing the diversity course requirements variable will allow for the differences between students to be more comparable (i.e., completion of diversity courses versus zero courses completed) especially among the interaction terms in a regression analysis.

Table 5 shows the results of the t-test and it reveals that there are no significant differences between the different mean levels of contemporary and classical expressions of racial prejudice and racism when taking into account diversity course exposure. Thus, it appears that these findings do not support the hypotheses that are concerned with the

educational effect of diversity course graduation requirements on opposition to race-based policy, racial prejudice and racism (H1-H4, H12 and H13) of this study.

Table 5. Independent Samples T-Test Results for Five Measures of Racial Prejudice and Racism Grouped by No Diversity Course Exposure and Diversity Course Exposure

	No Diversity course exposure (n= 439)		Diversity course exposure (n= 411)		
Variable	M	SD	M	SD	*T*
Stratification beliefs	3.13	.82	3.18	.84	-1.203
Symbolic Racism	2.91	.76	2.94	.82	-.429
Race-based policy	3.03	.80	2.95	.81	1.534
Threat	2.08	.72	2.12	.75	-.804
Classical racism	1.78	.88	1.67	.88	1.920

*p≤.05 **p≤.01 ***p≤.001

However, given that there was a very broad variation of the types of diversity courses completed in the first study, a decision was made to do an exploratory study (second study) that only examined the impact of race-based courses on racial attitudes. In addition, could students who had already fulfilled the diversity requirement and who were taking additional diversity courses express lower levels of racial prejudice? To examine these possibilities, a repeated (pre/post) design was employed to precisely examine students' racial attitudes at two different time periods during the semester (i.e., Time 1 represents those students at the beginning of the semester who just started their race-based course, and time 2 includes those

same students from time 1 who nearly completed their race-based course at the end of the semester).

In the second study, over 70 percent of the respondents came from small towns and rural areas (e.g., 37.2 percent came from small towns and 34.9 percent came from rural areas). The racial composition that students had experienced while growing up was almost identical to what students in the first study had experienced (M= 4.49 compared to M= 4.43 in the first study). All of the contemporary and classical measures of racial prejudice were constructed in the same way as in the first study. However, the diversity course requirement variable was not collapsed in the second study because race-based courses in particular were the focus of study and it was important to consider if the specific number of race-based courses completed had an effect on racial attitudes. Table 6 reveals the results of the paired t-test and it shows that there are no significant differences between the mean levels of stratification beliefs, racial prejudice, and racism of those students who had just started their race-based course versus almost completing it. Thus, it appears that the completion of one race-based course does not reduce students' level of racial prejudice and racism.

Table 6. Paired T-Test Results for Five Measures of Racial Prejudice and Racism as a Function of Pre- and Posttest Diversity Course Exposure

	Pre course exposure (n=67)		Post course exposure (n=67)		
Variable	M	SD	M	SD	*T*
Stratification beliefs	3.14	.75	3.11	.80	.307
Symbolic Racism	2.98	.71	3.08	.67	-1.076
Race-based policy	2.97	.77	2.99	.85	-.150
Threat	2.27	.63	2.26	.75	.137
Classical racism	1.68	.74	1.81	.70	-1.453

*p≤.05 **p≤.01 ***p≤.001

Furthermore, there appears to be no significant differences in the posttest racial prejudice and racism scores between those students who received the real questionnaire and those who received the placebo at Time 1. Thus, a testing effect was not found (see Table 7). However, since the control and the experimental groups were not randomly selected, it is difficult to draw any definitive conclusions about the non-existence of a testing effect (Campbell and Stanley, 1963). Nevertheless, the posttest scores indicate that the students who completed the pretest did not reduce their attitudes of racial prejudice and racism despite being exposed to the race-based course content. The mean levels of threat and classical racism are very low for both the control and experimental groups and there are no significant differences found between them. Of the 85 students who completed the placebo, 44 completed the posttest when they were nearly finished with their first race-based course.

Table 7. Independent Samples T-Test Posttest Results for Five Measures of Racial Prejudice and Racism Grouped by Either Receiving the Real Questionnaire (Experimental group) or Placebo (Control group) at Time 1

	(Control group) Posttest (n=44)		(Experimental group) Posttest (n=67)		
Variable	M	SD	M	SD	*T*
Stratification beliefs	2.90	.65	3.11	.80	1.794
Symbolic Racism	3.08	.65	3.08	.67	.081
Race-based policy	2.97	.77	2.99	.85	-1.944
Threat	2.30	.60	2.27	.75	-.305
Classical racism	2.09	.88	1.81	.70	.002

*p≤.05 **p≤.01 ***p≤.001

However, Table 8 shows there are significant differences in the mean levels of racial prejudice between those students who had almost completed one race-based course and those who had already fulfilled the diversity requirement and were about to complete an additional race-based course. The results of the independent samples t-tests in table 8 indicate that those students who had already fulfilled the diversity requirement and were about to complete an additional course, exhibited significantly less symbolic racism, are more likely to believe that racial discrimination still exists, and are more likely to support race-based policy than those students who were about to complete only one race-based course. In addition, the mean levels of threat and classical racism are very low for both groups and there are no significant differences found between them.

Table 8. Independent Samples T-Test Results for Five Measures of Racial Prejudice and Racism Grouped by Either Nearly Completing One Race-based course or Requirement Already Fulfilled and taking an Additional Course

	One Race-based course (n=67)		Requirement fulfilled plus additional course (n=35)		
Variable	M	SD	M	SD	*T*
Stratification beliefs	3.11	.80	2.63	.57	3.697***
Symbolic Racism	3.08	.67	2.78	.47	2.903**
Race-based policy	3.00	.85	2.60	.61	2.906**
Threat	2.27	.75	2.10	.52	1.652
Classical racism	1.81	.70	1.65	.49	1.727

*p≤.05 **p≤.01 ***p≤.001

An attempt was made to account for the possibility of a testing effect by comparing the pretest scores of both groups. The pretest results in Table 9 almost mirror that of the posttest results in Table 8 because those students who had already fulfilled the diversity requirement began the race-based course with much lower levels of symbolic racism and were more likely to support race-based policy than their counterparts. However, it is interesting to note that there was a tendency for both groups—i.e., those students who just started their first race-based course (M= 3.14) and those students who had already fulfilled the diversity requirement (M=3.06)—to believe that structural conditions do not prohibit Blacks from making socio-economic advancement.

Table 9. Independent Samples T-Test Pretest Results for Five Measures of Racial Prejudice and Racism Grouped by Either Just Starting Race-Based Course or Requirement Already Fulfilled

	Just Started (n=67)		Requirement Fulfilled (n=35)		
Variable	M	SD	M	SD	*T*
Stratification beliefs	3.14	.74	3.06	.65	.675
Symbolic Racism	3.00	.71	2.68	.46	2.948**
Race-based policy	3.00	.77	2.71	.44	2.462*
Threat	2.28	.63	2.27	.48	.137
Classical racism	1.68	.74	1.65	.52	.300

*p≤.05 **p≤.01 ***p≤.001

Even though the findings in Tables 8 and 9 seem to suggest that fulfilling the diversity requirement and taking additional race-based courses could reduce racial prejudice, this could largely be due to selection bias. That is, those students who had already fulfilled the diversity course requirement and were taking an additional race-based course may be more open to and interested in learning about racial prejudice and racism than those students who were just starting their race-based course for the first time.

After examining the t-tests in both studies and the correlations among the political and racial attitude predictors and the five measures of racial prejudice and racism, it would be useful to examine the predictors of racial prejudice and racism using regression analysis to explain the underlying structure of White racial attitudes. In addition, H5-H7 require an examination of the moderating and interaction effects to test the moderating effects of political conservatism and interracial friendship. Furthermore, examining the effects of

affective prejudice, negative stereotypes, and economic individualism on symbolic racism is essential because prior research shows that symbolic racism originates in a blend of anti-Black affect with the perception that Blacks violate cherished nonracial values. However, since the t-test and Pearson correlations do not test for confounding variables, these results should be interpreted cautiously.

Thus, regression models were constructed for three reasons. One reason was to examine the impact of diversity course exposure and to examine and compare the predictive power of both sets of predictors (socio-demographic and political and racial attitudes) on all of the five dependent measures of racial prejudice and racism (opposition to race-based policy, stratification beliefs, symbolic racism, threat, and classical racism). In conducting the stepwise regression analyses to find the most parsimonious models for predicting all of the five dependent measures of racial prejudice and racism, the socio-demographic variables were entered first into the regression equation. Next, the political and racial variables were entered individually and always in the same order to assess the unique effect and relative importance of each predictor in predicting opposition to race-based policy and contemporary expressions of racial prejudice and racism. This was done by examining the relative contribution of each predictor to the explained variance (changes in opposition to race-based policy, racial prejudice and racism R^2). In the last step, the diversity course requirement variable was added to assess its impact in conjunction with the socio-demographic and political and racial variables.

The second reason for conducting regression analyses was to explore the interaction effects hypotheses (H5-H7), suggesting that political conservatism and interracial friendship will moderate the direct relationships between diversity course exposure and the dependent

racial prejudice and racism measures. And the third reason was to identify those significant predictors of racial prejudice and racism that could help explain opposition to race-based policy. The standardized betas are presented rather than the unstandardized betas in the stepwise regression analyses without the interaction terms because the unstandardized betas are greatly influenced by the metrics on which they are based and as a result, they are not useful in making meaningful comparisons. The standardized betas are converted to a common base allowing for meaningful comparisons.

The results in table 10 reveal the unique contributions of the socio-demographic variables, political and racial attitudes, and diversity course exposure in predicting symbolic racism. Note that the R^2 and the contribution to change in the R^2 are presented for each of the five dependent measures of racial prejudice and racism. In the first model, symbolic racism was regressed on all of the socio-demographic variables. Model 1 shows that gender ($\beta = 0.14, p \leq .001$) is found to be the only socio-demographic variable to have a significant effect on symbolic racism. Although there is a strong relationship that could possibly suggest that men are more likely to blame Blacks themselves for their economic failure, it is important to note that only 2 percent of the variance is explained in symbolic racism.

In fact, as the political and racial predictors were added one by one into the regression equation, gender gradually becomes non-significant in predicting symbolic racism. Model 2 shows that the addition of political conservatism added 3.8 percent to the explained variance in predicting symbolic racism and gender did remain a significant predictor. However, model 3 reveals that when economic individualism entered the regression equation next, there was a substantial increase in the explained variance of symbolic racism (R^2 change of 14.6 percent). Even more interesting, model 5 shows that after egalitarianism and affective

prejudice entered into the regression equation respectively, economic individualism (β = 0.36, $p \leq .001$) remained the strongest predictor followed by egalitarianism (β = -0.22, $p \leq$ .001) and then affective prejudice (β = 0.12, $p \leq .001$). Gender was no longer statistically significant and thus was excluded from the model.

Table 10. Stepwise Regression Analysis Predicting Symbolic Racism with Socio-Demographic and Political and Racial Variables

Variables	β	R^2	ΔR^2
Model 1		2.0%	
Gender (male)	0.14***		
	(.055)		
Model 2		5.8%	3.8%
Political conservatism	0.19***		
	(.022)		
Gender	0.13***		
	(.054)		
Model 3		20.4%	14.6%
Economic individualism	0.38***		
	(.022)		
Political conservatism	0.16***		
	(.020)		
Gender	0.11***		
	(.050)		
Model 4		26.6%	6.2%
Economic individualism	0.37***		
	(.021)		
Egalitarianism	-0.26***		
	(.039)		
Political conservatism	0.11***		
	(.020)		
Gender (male)	0.07*		
	(.049)		

*p≤.05 **p≤.01 ***p≤.001 n= 820

Note: In bold are the variables that are added at each step. Standard errors are in parentheses.

Table 10. (continued)

Variables	β	R^2	ΔR^2
Model 5		27.9%	1.3%
Economic individualism	0.36***		
	(.021)		
Egalitarianism	-0.22***		
	(.041)		
Affective prejudice	0.12***		
	(.034)		
Political conservatism	0.11***		
	(.020)		
Model 6		31.2%	3.3%
Economic individualism	0.36***		
	(.020)		
Egalitarianism	-0.21***		
	(.040)		
Negative stereotypes	0.20***		
	(.039)		
Political conservatism	0.10***		
	(.019)		
Affective prejudice	0.08*		
	(.034)		
Diversity course exposure			

*p≤.05 **p≤.01 ***p≤.001 n= 820

Note: In bold are the variables that are added at each step. Standard errors are in parentheses.

However, when negative stereotypes entered the regression equation, it becomes quite clear that negative stereotypes ($\beta = 0.20, p \leq .001$) rather than affective prejudice ($\beta = 0.08, p \leq .001$) plays a much stronger role as the anti-Black affect in predicting symbolic racism. In the last step, diversity course exposure was added to the regression equation but did not have a significant impact on symbolic racism as evidenced by the R^2 not changing. Thus, no beta coefficient was presented for diversity course exposure because it was excluded from the overall model.

The overall model (model 6) shows that economic individualism ($\beta = 0.36, p \leq .001$) is the strongest predictor followed by egalitarianism ($\beta = -0.21, p \leq .001$), negative stereotypes ($\beta = 0.20, p \leq .001$), and political conservatism ($\beta = 0.10, p \leq .001$). The very strong positive association between economic individualism and symbolic racism is consistent with the strong positive bivariate correlation between economic individualism and symbolic racism. Thus, these findings provide sufficient support for hypothesis 8 of this study that hypothesizes that economic individualism will predict symbolic racism in the positive direction. Consistent with prior research, the results in the overall model reveal that those students who believe that America is a land of opportunity in which success depends on individual effort are more likely to blame Blacks themselves for their social and economic failures (Sears et al., 1997).

In addition, as hypothesized (hypothesis 9) in this study, the overall model shows that there is clear evidence of an anti-Black affect that predicts symbolic racism. This finding is consistent with prior research in that Sears et al. (1997) found that negative stereotypes of Blacks had a significant positive effect on symbolic racism (i.e., the belief that Blacks make excessive demands on the status quo).

Consistent with the bivariate correlations, egalitarianism was found to negatively predict symbolic racism (Hughes, 1997; Sears et al., 2000). These findings in the overall model clearly support hypothesis 10 of this study that hypothesized that egalitarianism will be negatively related to racial prejudice and racism. With economic individualism as the strongest predictor followed by egalitarianism, interpreting the negative relationship between egalitarianism and symbolic racism must begin with students believing that hard work alone will guarantee success for Blacks. Thus, the negative association between egalitarianism and

symbolic racism could suggest that those students who believe that society should not be responsible for creating more equal opportunities for Blacks to succeed are more likely to believe that Blacks can succeed if they try harder without any special assistance from society.

And lastly, political conservatism ($\beta = 0.10, p \leq .001$) although not as strong as negative stereotypes and egalitarianism, predicts symbolic racism. In particular, those students who are politically conservative may be more likely to harbor symbolic racist ideology. It appears that symbolic racism has substantial origins in anti-Black affect and economic individualism as well as in egalitarianism. This is a significant finding because prior research found that the attitudinal origins of symbolic racism lie in a blend of anti-Black affect and economic individualism (Hughes, 1997; Sears et al., 1997). Furthermore, three years later, Sears et al. (2000) concluded that the lack of egalitarianism among Americans could be linked to symbolic racism in the sense that those Americans who harbor symbolic racist ideology believe that further action by society to ensure equality for Blacks will not help Blacks succeed; the road to success ultimately depends upon Blacks themselves. The parsimonious model for predicting symbolic racism was significant ($F = 62.384, p \leq .001$) and accounted for 31.2 percent of the variance.

Table 11 examines the unique contributions of the socio-demographic characteristics, political and racial attitudes, and diversity course exposure in predicting threat. The socio-demographic variables entered the model first. Three socio-demographic characteristics are found to be statistically significant in predicting threat. Model 1 shows that Gender ($\beta = 0.19$ $p \leq .001$) is the strongest socio-demographic predictor indicating that men are more likely than women to feel threatened by Blacks in competing for valued resources such as housing and jobs. Next, father's graduate degree ($\beta = -0.08, p \leq .05$) has a small effect in the negative

direction followed by rural ($\beta = 0.07, p \leq .05$) having a slight positive effect in predicting threat. Students that are especially from rural areas may more likely feel threatened by Black competition. In contrast, those students with fathers with a master's degree or Ph.D. may not feel threatened by Black competition. However, keep in mind that these three socio-demographic predictors only explain 4.5 percent of the variance in threat.

Political conservatism ($\beta = .12, p \leq .001$) was the first political predictor to enter into the model next and was found to be statistically significant but added very little to the explained variance (R^2 change of 1.5 percent). Economic individualism entered next, but had no impact on the model whatsoever and thus dropped out. The fact that economic individualism does not predict threat may suggest that threat taps the social structural dynamics of group dominance and competition whereas symbolic racism uncovers the social psychological dynamics of resentment of Blacks for violating individualism.

However, when egalitarianism entered the regression model, a substantial contribution was made to the explained variation in the level of threat (R^2 change of 8 percent). Indeed, egalitarianism ($\beta = -.25, p \leq .001$) remained the strongest predictor of threat even after negative stereotypes ($\beta = 0.20, p \leq .001$) and affective prejudice ($\beta = 0.11, p \leq .01$) were accounted for in model 6 (overall model). Consistent with the bivariate correlations, egalitarianism not only negatively predicts threat, but also is the strongest predictor. These findings clearly support the hypothesized relationship between threat and egalitarianism (hypothesis 10). Furthermore, like symbolic racism, the anti-Black affect for threat is more apparent through negative stereotypes than it is for affective prejudice.

Table 11. Stepwise Regression Analysis Predicting Threat with Socio-Demographic and Political and Racial Variables

Variables	β	R^2	ΔR^2
Model 1		4.5%	
Gender (male)	0.19***		
	(.050)		
Graduate degree (father)	-0.08*		
	(.073)		
Rural	0.07*		
	(.055)		
Model 2		6.0%	1.5%
Gender (male)	0.18***		
	(.050)		
Political conservatism	0.12***		
	(.020)		
Graduate degree (father)	-0.09**		
	(.073)		
Model 3		6.0%	0.00%
Gender (male)	0.18***		
	(.050)		
Political conservatism	0.12***		
	(.020)		
Graduate degree (father)	-0.09**		
	(.073)		
Economic individualism			
Model 4		14.1%	8.0%
Egalitarianism	-0.32***		
	(.038)		
Gender (male)	0.12***		
	(.049)		
Graduate degree (father)	-0.08*		
	(.070)		
Rural	0.07*		
	(.052)		

*p≤.05 **p≤.01 ***p≤.001 n= 820

Note: In bold are the variables that are added at each step. Standard errors are in parentheses.

Table 11. (continued)

Variables	β	R^2	ΔR^2
Model 5		16.1%	2.0%
Egalitarianism	-0.27***		
	(.040)		
Affective prejudice	0.15***		
	(.034)		
Gender (male)	0.10**		
	(.048)		
Graduate degree (father)	-0.08**		
	(.069)		
Rural	0.08*		
	(.052)		
Model 6		19.7%	3.5%
Egalitarianism	-0.25***		
	(.039)		
Negative stereotypes	0.20***		
	(.039)		
Gender (male)	0.11***		
	(.047)		
Affective prejudice	0.11**		
	(.034)		
Rural	0.09**		
	(.051)		
Graduate degree (father)	-0.07*		
	(.068)		
Diversity course exposure			

*p≤.05 **p≤.01 ***p≤.001 n= 820

Note: In bold are the variables that are added at each step. Standard errors are in parentheses.

Interestingly, in contrast to symbolic racism, even though the significant positive effect of gender has decreased net of political and racial variables, gender still remains to have a statistically significant effect on threat ($\beta = 0.11, p \leq .001$). This finding is consistent with the gender socialization research that contends that women are socialized more so than

man to be connected to social relationships and as a result, are more likely than man to agree that interracial contact is desirable (Johnson and Marini, 1998).

Although slightly significant, the standardized beta for rural ($\beta = .09, p \leq .01$) increases in significance net of political/racial variables thereby suggesting that students from rural areas could more likely be threatened by Black competition for jobs and housing. However, in contrast, those students with fathers with higher levels of educational achievement maintains its marginal effect on threat thereby suggesting that students who have fathers with a master's or Ph.D. degree may not feel as threatened by Black competition.

In the last step, diversity course exposure entered the regression model with all the other predictors accounted for but was excluded from the overall model because it had no effect on threat as evidenced by the R^2 not changing. Thus, no beta coefficient was presented for diversity course exposure. The parsimonious model for threat was significant ($F = 33.238, p \leq .001$) and accounted for 19.7 percent of the variance in threat.

Table 12 presents the models that demonstrate how the socio-demographic factors, political and racial variables, and diversity course exposure predict classical racism. When the socio-demographic variables were entered in the first model, none of them were found to be significant predictors of classical racism and so none of the beta coefficients are presented for the socio-demographic variables. However, when the political and racial predictors were entered into the models one by one, the variation in explaining classical racism began to increase substantially.

Some of the findings are similar to what was found to predict threat. For example, egalitarianism ($\beta = -0.24, p \leq .001$) not only negatively predicts classical racism, but also is

the strongest predictor. Again, consistent with bivariate correlations, these findings clearly support hypothesis 10 that hypothesizes that egalitarianism will be negatively related to racial prejudice and racism. Furthermore, economic individualism did not have any effect on classical racism and thus was excluded from the overall model.

Table 12. Stepwise Regression Analysis Predicting Classical Racism with Socio-Demographic and Political and Racial Variables

Variables	β	R^2	ΔR^2
Model 1		0.00%	
Model 2			
Political conservatism	0.12**	1.3%	1.3%
	(.025)		
Model 3		1.4%	0.1%
Political conservatism	0.12***		
	(.025)		
Economic individualism			
Model 4		7.9%	6.5%
Egalitarianism	-0.28***		
	(.047)		
Model 5		9.1%	1.2%
Egalitarianism	-0.24***		
	(.049)		
Affective prejudice	0.11***		
	(.042)		
Model 6		11.2%	2.1%
Egalitarianism	-0.23***		
	(.049)		
Negative stereotypes	0.15***		
	(.049)		
Affective prejudice	0.08*		
	(.043)		

*p≤.05 **p≤.01 ***p≤.001 n= 820

Note: In bold are the variables that are added at each step. Standard errors are in parentheses.

Table 12. (continued)

Variables	β	R^2	ΔR^2
Model 7		12.1%	0.9%
Egalitarianism	-0.24***		
	(.049)		
Negative stereotypes	0.15***		
	(.049)		
Diversity course requirement	-0.10**		
	(.058)		
Affective prejudice	0.08*		
	(.043)		

*p≤.05 **p≤.01 ***p≤.001 n= 820
Note: In bold are the variables that are added at each step. Standard errors are in parentheses.

Unlike symbolic racism, both classical racism and threat tap the social structural dynamics of racial group dominance. Thus, a different interpretation as to why egalitarianism has such a strong effect on threat and classical racism could be offered. That is, those White students who feel threatened by Black competition and feel that they are superior over them are more likely to believe that society should not have any responsibility in creating more equal opportunities because creating more equal opportunities could possibly interfere with preserving their racial group's interests.

In addition, an anti-Black affect that is mainly composed of negative stereotypes ($\beta = 0.15, p \leq .001$) predicts classical racism. Affective prejudice ($\beta = -0.08, p \leq .05$) is found to be marginally significant in its prediction of classical racism. Interestingly, diversity course requirement exposure ($\beta = -0.10, p \leq .01$) is negatively associated with classical racism. The weak effect of diversity course requirement exposure on classical racism could suggest that those students who completed one to no more than two diversity course requirements are more likely to reduce their classical racist attitudes (i.e., White superiority). However, when

diversity course exposure entered into model 7, there was only a .9 percent increase to explaining the overall variance in classical racism and so the likelihood that diversity course exposure reduces classical racist attitudes may be due to chance. Indeed, the bivariate correlation between diversity course exposure and classical racism is not significant (see Table 3a). In addition, the independent samples t-test results do not indicate that diversity course exposure had an impact on classical racist attitudes. The parsimonious model for classical racism was significant ($F = 28.193, p \leq .001$) but only accounted for 12.1 percent of the variance in classical racism.

Table 13 presents the unique contributions of the socio-demographic and political/racial variables in predicting stratification beliefs (i.e., opportunity structure is fair and Blacks are receiving more than they deserve via preferential treatment). In the first model, stratification beliefs was regressed on all of the socio-demographic variables. Gender ($\beta = 0.12, p \leq .001$) is the only socio-demographic variable to have a significant effect on stratification beliefs. Consistent with prior research men are more likely to believe that racial discrimination is not hindering Blacks from making socio-economic progress and thus Blacks are receiving more than they deserve (Hughes and Tuch, 2003). However, model 1 shows that gender explains only 1.4 percent of the variance in stratification beliefs and so this finding must be interpreted with extreme caution.

Indeed as the political and racial predictors enter the model one by one, the effect of gender becomes non-significant. It is interesting to note that economic individualism does not make much of a contribution to the explained variation of stratification beliefs as it did for symbolic racism but remains statistically significant even after egalitarianism, affective

prejudice, and negative stereotypes entered the equation. Model 4 shows that political conservatism was excluded from the model after egalitarianism entered the model.

Table 13. Stepwise Regression Analysis Predicting Stratification Beliefs with Socio-Demographic and Political and Racial Variables

Variables	β	R^2	ΔR^2
Model 1		1.4%	
Gender (male)	0.12***		
	(.058)		
Model 2		2.2%	0.8%
Gender (male)	0.11**		
	(.058)		
Political conservatism	0.09**		
	(.023)		
Model 3		3.3%	1.1%
Economic individualism	0.11***		
	(.025)		
Gender (male)	0.11**		
	(.057)		
Political conservatism	0.08*		
	(.023)		
Model 4		20.0%	16.7%
Egalitarianism	-0.43***		
	(.042)		
Economic individualism	0.09**		
	(.023)		
Model 5		21.3%	1.3%
Egalitarianism	-0.39***		
	(.044)		
Affective prejudice	0.13***		
	(.037)		
Economic individualism	0.09**		
	(.023)		

*p≤.05 **p≤.01 ***p≤.001 n= 820

Note: In bold are the variables that are added at each step. Standard errors are in parentheses.

Table 13. (continued)

Variables	β	R^2	ΔR^2
Model 6		21.3%	0.00%
Egalitarianism	-0.39***		
	(.044)		
Affective prejudice	0.13***		
	(.037)		
Economic individualism	0.09**		
	(.023)		
Negative stereotypes			
Diversity course exposure			

*p≤.05 **p≤.01 ***p≤.001 n= 820

Note: In bold are the variables that are added at each step. Standard errors are in parentheses.

Egalitarianism ($\beta = -0.43, p \leq .001$) was found to be the strongest predictor followed by economic individualism ($\beta = 0.09, p \leq .01$) in model 4. Both egalitarianism and economic individualism accounted for 20 percent of the variance explained in stratification beliefs.

Next, affective prejudice ($\beta = 0.13, p \leq .001$) entered the equation and was found to be statistically significant in model 5. Although only 1.3 percent was added to the variance explained in stratification beliefs when affective prejudice was added to the regression model, affective prejudice remained statistically significant when negative stereotypes was entered next. What's most interesting is that negative stereotypes was found not to have a significant effect on predicting stratification beliefs and was removed from the equation. The impact of affective prejudice on stratification beliefs captures a subtle anti-Black affect. This finding suggests that those students who seldom feel any sympathy and admiration for Blacks are more likely to believe that there are no structural barriers as a residual effect of generations of slavery preventing Blacks from succeeding and thus there is no reason why

Blacks should receive any special kind of treatment to help them succeed. Indeed, doing so would violate the fundamental individualistic principle of meritocracy. In the last step, diversity course exposure was entered in the equation and was removed because it had no impact on stratification beliefs.

In the overall model (model 6), egalitarianism ($\beta = -0.39, p \leq .001$) is found to be the strongest predictor followed by affective prejudice ($\beta = 0.13, p \leq .001$) and then economic individualism ($\beta = 0.09, p \leq .01$). The very strong negative association between egalitarianism and stratification beliefs is consistent with the strong negative bivariate correlation between egalitarianism and stratification beliefs. Thus, these findings provide ample support for hypothesis 14 that hypothesizes that egalitarianism negatively predicts stratification beliefs. The results of the overall model clearly suggest that the driving force behind the belief that the opportunity structure is fair and that achieving success depends on one's own efforts is not based on gender differences, but among both female and male students who share in common values such as individualism, self reliance, and the work ethic (Hughes and Tuch, 2003). The parsimonious model that predicts stratification beliefs was significant ($F = 55.354, p \leq .001$) and accounted for 21.3 percent of the variance in stratification beliefs.

Table 14 presents the unique contributions of the socio-demographic factors, political/racial variables, and diversity course exposure in predicting opposition to race-based policy (i.e., oppose governmental intervention to help Blacks). In the first step, the socio-demographic variables were entered into model 1. Although, moderately significant, gender ($\beta = 0.09, p \leq .01$) positively predicts opposition to race-based policy. This finding is consistent with prior research in that women are more likely than men to support

governmental intervention to assist Blacks (Hughes and Tuch, 2003). Next, it is interesting to point out that father's less than high school education ($\beta = -0.08, p \leq .05$) has a marginal negative effect on opposition to race-based policy. However, it should be noted that those students with fathers with less than a high school education are so few in the sample (approximately 2.5 percent). White racial composition ($\beta = 0.07, p \leq .05$) (i.e., degree of interracial contact) also has a marginal effect on opposition to race-based policy but in the positive direction suggesting that those students who grew up in mostly White communities are less likely to support race-based policy to eradicate racial inequality. However, model 1 shows that these socio-demographic variables explain very little of the variation in opposition to race-based policy ($R^2 = 2$ percent).

In fact, when the political and racial predictors entered in the regression equation individually gender, father's less than high school education, and white racial composition all gradually become non-significant. Similar to the prediction patterns for stratification beliefs, economic individualism does not contribute much to the explained variance in predicting race-based policy, but remains statistically significant even after egalitarianism and affective prejudice entered the equation. Also, model 4 reveals that political conservatism was excluded from the regression model when egalitarianism entered into the equation. Furthermore, model 4 also reveals that egalitarianism ($\beta = -0.36, p \leq .001$) is the strongest predictor of opposition to race-based policy followed by economic individualism ($\beta = 0.10, p \leq .01$). Both egalitarianism and economic individualism accounted for 15.6 percent of the variance explained in opposition to race-based policy in model 4. What this seems to suggest thus far is that opposition to race-base policy arises from the belief that success is based on working hard and putting forth the effort to succeed not by receiving special treatment.

Table 14. Stepwise Regression Analysis Predicting Opposition to Race-based Policy with Socio-Demographic and Political and Racial Variables

Variables	β	R^2	ΔR^2
Model 1		2.0%	
Gender (male)	0.09**		
	(.056)		
Less than high school (father)	-0.08*		
	(.190)		
White racial composition	0.07*		
	(.048)		
Model 2		3.4%	1.4%
Political conservatism	0.12***		
	(.022)		
Gender (male)	0.08*		
	(.055)		
Less than high school (father)	-0.08**		
	(.188)		
White racial composition	0.07*		
	(.048)		
Model 3		4.7%	1.3%
Economic individualism	0.11***		
	(.024)		
Political conservatism	0.11***		
	(.022)		
Gender	0.08*		
	(.055)		
Less than high school (father)	-0.08*		
	(.188)		
Model 4		15.6%	10.9%
Egalitarianism	-0.36***		
	(.042)		
Economic individualism	0.10**		
	(.023)		

*p≤.05 **p≤.01 ***p≤.001 n= 820

Note: In bold are the variables that are added at each step. Standard errors are in parentheses.

Table 14. (continued)

Variables	β	R^2	ΔR^2
Model 5		19.2%	3.6%
Egalitarianism	-0.30***		
	(.043)		
Affective prejudice	0.20***		
	(.037)		
Economic individualism	0.09**		
	(.022)		
Model 6		19.2%	0.00%
Egalitarianism	-0.30***		
	(.043)		
Affective prejudice	0.20***		
	(.037)		
Economic individualism	0.09*		
	(.022)		
Negative stereotypes			
Model 7		20.0%	0.8%
Egalitarianism	-0.30***		
	(.043)		
Affective prejudice	0.20***		
	(.037)		
Diversity course requirement	-0.09**		
	(.051)		
Economic individualism	-0.09**		
	(.022)		

*p≤.05 **p≤.01 ***p≤.001 n= 820

Note: In bold are the variables that are added at each step. Standard errors are in parentheses.

Most interesting, affective prejudice ($\beta = 0.20\ p \leq .001$) entered the equation and was found to be a significant predictor of opposition to raced-based policy. Model 5 shows that the addition of affective prejudice resulted in an increase of 3.6 percent in the variance explained in opposition to race-based policy. As was the case in predicting stratification beliefs, affective prejudice is the source of the anti-Black affect in predicting opposition to

race-based policy. Negative stereotypes did not have a significant effect on opposition to race-based policy and thus was eliminated from the model.

In the last step, diversity course exposure ($\beta = -0.09$ $p \leq .01$) entered the overall model (model 7) and was found to slightly predict opposition to race-based policy in the negative direction. The slight negative effect of diversity course exposure on opposition to race-based policy offers weak support for the possibility for those students who completed one to no more than two diversity courses are more likely to support race-based policy. However, the addition of diversity course exposure only added .8 percent to explaining the overall variance in opposition to race-based policy and so the likelihood that diversity course exposure causes students to support race-based policy could be due to chance. There isn't enough empirical evidence to suggest otherwise. The bivariate correlation between diversity course exposure and race-based policy is not significant (see Table 3a). In addition, the independent samples t-test that was conducted did not indicate that those students who completed one to no more than two diversity courses were more likely to oppose race-based policy.

In the overall model (model 7), egalitarianism ($\beta = -0.30, p \leq .001$) is found to be the strongest predictor of opposition to race-based policy followed by affective prejudice ($\beta = 0.20, p \leq .001$) and then diversity course exposure ($\beta = -0.09, p \leq .01$), and economic individualism ($\beta = 0.09, p \leq .01$). The results in the overall model seem to indicate that opposition to race-based policy stems from the belief that societal efforts to increase racial equality for Blacks to succeed are unnecessary. More specifically, those students who endorse this belief are those who seldom feel sympathy and admiration for Blacks.

The findings in model 7 do not support hypothesis 11 of this study and that is, the strongest predictors of symbolic racism will also be the strongest predictors of opposition to race-based policy. Recall that economic individualism was the strongest predictor of symbolic racism which is not the case with opposition to race-based policy. Economic individualism only slightly predicts opposition to race-based policy after all the other political and racial variables are accounted for in the model. Egalitarianism rather than economic individualism was the strongest predictor of opposition to race-based policy. Furthermore, although egalitarianism was the second strongest predictor for symbolic racism, negative stereotypes was found to strongly predict symbolic racism which is not the case for opposition to race-based policy. Affective prejudice rather than negative stereotypes was a stronger anti-Black affect predictor of opposition to race-based policy. Model 7, the overall model, was significant ($F = 29.091, p \leq .001$) and accounted for 20 percent of the variance explained in opposition to race-based policy.

The final analysis was focused on testing the interaction hypotheses 5-7 of this study. This study hypothesized that interracial friendship moderates the direct relationship between diversity course exposure and racial prejudice and racism (hypothesis 5). More specifically, hypothesis 5 hypothesizes that the more interracial friendships experienced before college will result in an increase in the effect of diversity course exposure on reducing racial prejudice and racism. However, the opposite is hypothesized for political conservatism. Hypothesis 6 suggests that greater conservatism will result in lessening the effect of diversity course exposure on reducing racial prejudice and racism. In addition, past research has concluded that political conservatism has an effect on Whites' opposition to affirmative action, and this effect increases as a function of higher levels of formal education (Bobo, et

al., 1996). Thus, hypothesis 7 suggests that greater conservatism will result in lessening the effect of diversity course exposure on reducing opposition to race-based policy. Two interaction variables or terms were developed by multiplying the diversity course exposure item with political conservatism (first interaction term) and multiplying the diversity exposure item with interracial friendship (second interaction term).

In order to illustrate the possible empirical existence of these interaction effects as hypothesized in this study, both the marginal effects without the interaction terms (reduced model) and the interaction effects (complete model) are presented in tables 15 and 16. Only undstandardized regression coefficients will be presented and discussed in the analyses of interactions. Standardized betas are not recommended in analyses using interaction terms because they are computed in such a way that inhibits an accurate interpretation of product terms (Jaccard, Turrisi, Wan, 1990). The R^2 for the complete model is presented to show how much of the variance is explained in symbolic racism, threat, and classical racism by the interaction terms plus the variables from which these interaction terms were constructed.

Table 15 displays the results of the three dependent racial prejudice and racism measures regressed on the marginal effects (i.e. the variables from which these interaction terms were constructed), the interaction term of political conservatism and diversity course exposure, and the interaction term of interracial friendship and diversity course exposure. Table 15 shows that none of the interactions of interracial friendship and diversity course exposure were found to be statistically significant and so interracial friendship does not moderate the direct relationship between diversity course exposure and racial prejudice/racism as suggested in hypothesis 5.

However, Table 15 does show that the only significant moderating effect, albeit marginally significant, was with political conservatism ($\beta = .087, p \leq .05$) having a moderating effect in the positive direction on the diversity course exposure and symbolic racism relationship. Hence, this finding does seem to support hypothesis 6 by suggesting that political conservatism does effect the direct relationship between diversity course exposure and symbolic as evidenced by the positive partial slope between the interaction term and symbolic racism. That is, for those students who are politically conservative, experiencing diversity course exposure will more likely enhance or increase their symbolic racist ideology rather than decrease it.

Table 15. Regressions of Three Dependent Measures of Racial Prejudice and Racism on Interactions Between Either Diversity Course Exposure and Political Conservatism or Diversity Course Exposure and Interracial Friendship

	Marginal Effects			
Variable name	Variable	Diversity	Interaction	R^2
Symbolic racism				
Political conservatism	.127***	.005	.087*[1]	.045
	(.021)	(.053)	(.043)	
Interracial friendship	-.006	.026	.001[2]	.002
	(.006)	(.055)	(.027)	
Classical Racism				
Political conservatism	.090***	-.128*	-.015[1]	.021
	(.024)	(.060)	(.021)	
Interracial friendship	-.009	-.127*	-.011[2]	.008
	(.005)	(.061)	(.030)	
Threat				
Political conservatism	.086***	.028	.004[1]	.022
	(.020)	(.050)	(.040)	
Interracial friendship	-.009	.037	-.037[2]	.008
	(.005)	(.050)	(.027)	

*p≤.05 **p≤.01 ***p≤.001

Unstandardized beta coefficients. Standard errors are in parentheses.

[1] Diversity course exposure x Political conservatism

[2] Diversity course exposure x Interracial friendship

However, the rest of the political and racial variables are not accounted for in the model and so an additional stepwise regression procedure was performed to control for these other variables. The results are presented below.

Table 15a presents the stepwise regression analysis that controls for the remaining variables in the parsimonious model for predicting symbolic racism. In order to control for the other existing variables and to see if the interaction terms (diversity course exposure and political conservatism and diversity course exposure and interracial friendship) may contribute to any change in R^2, the variables were entered in one block at a time. For example, in the first stage, the socio-demographic characteristics were entered as block 1. Next, in the second stage, the political and racial predictors were entered as block 2. Lastly, at stage 3, diversity course exposure was added and then the interaction terms.

The standardized coefficients are presented in Table 15a for those variables that met the conventional criteria of significance. Note that the stage 2 model in Table 15a is exactly the same as the parsimonious model (model 6) in table 10. None of the interaction terms were found to be statistically significant and so their coefficients are not presented in Table 15a because they were excluded from the overall model. Based on these findings, it is concluded that after controlling for the effects of the other political and racial predictors of symbolic racism, the results do not support hypothesis 6 that suggested that political conservatism would moderate the direct relationship between diversity course exposure and symbolic racism.

The exact same stepwise procedures were conducted in order to control for the other variables that remained in the parsimonious models for predicting threat and classical racism. After entering the interaction terms in the model at stage 3 for both threat and classical

racism, the interaction effects were not found to be statistical significant and thus were dropped from the overall models. The R^2s of the parsimonious models for predicting threat and classical racism (Tables 11 and 12 respectively) did not change and so once again there is no evidence to support the interaction effects hypotheses for interracial friendship and political conservatism.

Table 15a. Stepwise Regression Analysis Predicting Symbolic Racism with Socio-Demographic and Anti-Black Affect, and Interactions Between Diversity Course Exposure and Anti-Black Affect

Variables	β	R^2	ΔR^2
Step 1: Socio-demographic		2.0%	
Gender (male)	0.14***		
	(.055)		
Step 2: Political/ Racial		31.2%	29.2%
Economic individualism	0.36***		
	(.020)		
Egalitarianism	0.18***		
	(.040)		
Negative stereotypes	0.20***		
	(.039)		
Political conservatism	0.10***		
	(.019)		
Affective prejudice	0.08*		
	(.034)		
Step 3: Diversity course exposure and Interactions		31.2%	0.00
Diversity course exposure			
Diversity course exposurexPolitical conservatism			
Diversity course exposurexInterracial friendship			

*p≤.05 **p≤.01 ***p≤.001 n= 820
Standardized beta coefficients. Standard errors are in parentheses.

Table 16 reveals that although the marginal effect of political conservatism ($\beta = .084$, $p \leq .05$) on opposition to race-based policy is significant, the interaction term of political conservatism and diversity course exposure on opposition to race-based policy is not significant. Thus there is no evidence to support hypothesis 7 that suggests that political conservatism will moderate the direct relationship between diversity course exposure and opposition to race-based policy. Even after controlling for the other variables in the parsimonious model for predicting opposition to race-based policy (Table 14), the interaction effect of political conservatism is not found to be statistically significant.

Table 16. Regression of Opposition to Race-based policy on the Interaction Between Political Conservatism and Diversity Course Exposure

	Marginal Effects			
Variable name	Variable	Diversity	Interaction	R^2
Opposition to Race policy				
Political conservatism	.084***	-.096	.073	.023
	(.022)	(.055)	(.044)	

*p≤.05 **p≤.01 ***p≤.001
Unstandardized beta coefficients. Standard errors are in parentheses.

CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The first empirical goal of this study was to identify the underlying structure of contemporary expressions of racial prejudice and racism. The results of the factor analysis revealed that opposition to race-based policy and the social psychological (symbolic racism) and social structural (threat and classical racism) measures are distinct dimensions of White racial attitudes that can be empirically differentiated. Although the correlation analysis found the factors to be correlated, symbolic racism, opposition to race-based policy, threat, and classical racism do not function as if they are measuring identical dimensions. In addition, the reliability analyses that were conducted for each racial prejudice and racism scale indicated that these scales are reliable constructs with which to measure opposition to race-based policy and the social psychological and social structural dimensions of racial prejudice and racism.

The factor analysis also revealed that two items of the original five-item scale of symbolic racism loaded together on a separate factor. Consequently, this study argues that the two items that loaded together, "Generations of slavery and discrimination have created conditions that make it difficult for Blacks to work their way out of the lower class" and "Over the past few years, Blacks have gotten less than they deserve" do not measure the essential notion of symbolic racism (i.e., Blacks are violating American cherished values by not "trying hard" enough) but rather measure students' perceptions regarding the extent to which the opportunity structure is fair and free from racial discrimination for Blacks in the United States. Furthermore, the reliability analysis of these two items was found to be reliable for measuring Whites' stratification beliefs. This separate factor of stratification beliefs that has emerged in the factor analysis supports the criticisms of the original five-item

symbolic racism scale of measuring more than one phenomenon (Hughes, 1997; Sears et al., 1997).

In looking at the mean levels of threat, classical racism, stratification beliefs, and symbolic racism, we see that, consistent with prior research, students rejected old-fashioned racist beliefs and were leaning more towards believing that the opportunity structure is fair and that Blacks are violating the work ethic by not "trying hard" enough to succeed. Indeed, students were likely to believe in the abstract principle of equality (egalitarianism) and that "America is a land of opportunity in which you only need to work hard to succeed" (economic individualism).

However, it is important to mention that although the mean-level gaps between symbolic racism (M = 3.00) and threat (M = 2.10) t(850) = -27.427 and symbolic racism (M = 3.00) and classical racism (M = 1.73) t(850) = 33.586 are quite significant, students' responses to the statements that promoted symbolic racism and opposition to race-based policy can be characterized as being "middle-of-the-road" responses (Berinsky, 1999). In other words, there was a very strong tendency for students to answer in the middle (i.e., 3—"neither agree nor disagree") on the 5-point Likert scales of symbolic racism and opposition to race-based policy.

Imagine, for example, a student who holds anti-Black attitudes (i.e., blames Blacks for not living up to the American Creed) and also recognizes that public expressions of such anti-Black attitudes are socially condemned. Then, suddenly the student finds him or herself being questioned about his or her attitudes about Blacks. Is the student more likely to hide his or her anti-Black attitudes and give a socially desirable response? Recent experimental studies have provided some evidence that suggests that contemporary measures of racism

like the symbolic racism scale are subject to social desirability concerns (Bonilla-Silva, 2003; Fazio and Dunton, 1997). Although testing for social desirability effects was beyond the scope of this study, it is important to at least acknowledge that the racial prejudice and racism measures used in this study could be vulnerable to social desirability effects (Berinsky, 1997; Bobo and Licari, 1989).

However, consistent with prior research on the persistence of negative stereotypes of Blacks, this study showed that White undergraduate students demonstrated a tendency to rate Blacks as being more violent and more likely to live off welfare compared to Whites (Bobo et al., 1997; Sears et al., 1997). In contrast, prior research has found that Whites rated Blacks as being lazy as opposed to hard working and as less intelligent compared to Whites (Bobo et al., 1997). However, consistent with Bobo et al. (1997) findings, the findings of this study showed that Whites rated Blacks as more likely to prefer living off welfare than Whites.

In addition to the negative stereotyping of Blacks, over two-thirds of the undergraduate students indicated that they seldom felt sympathy for Blacks and over half of them indicated that they seldom felt admiration. Consistent with recent research, the empirical evidence of negative stereotyping and the lack of positive emotions for Blacks in this study clearly supports that there is an anti-Black affect (Sears and Henry, 2003). Given the empirical existence of the anti-Black affect in this study, it must be reiterated that the origins or predictors of symbolic racism lie in a blend of anti-Black affect and economic individualism (Sears and Henry, 2003; Sears et al., 1997). In addition, past research has shown that an anti-Black affect (i.e., negative stereotypes of Blacks in particular) is one of the reasons why Whites do not support race-based policy (Bobo, 2000; Sears et al., 1997).

The second empirical goal of this study was to examine whether diversity course graduation requirements reduce racial prejudice and racism and increase support for race-based policy. In addition, two additional hypotheses (H12 and H13) were constructed to test whether diversity course graduation requirements have an affect on students' beliefs about the opportunity structure for Blacks (stratification beliefs). Sociological research studies that examine how diversity course graduation requirements impact racial attitudes are rare. However, Downey and Torrecilha's (1994) nation-wide research on the impact of diversity course graduation requirements is the only research study to date that offers compelling insights on the nature of contemporary racial attitudes and how the diversity course graduation requirements affect them. Thus, the first set of hypotheses (H1-H4) plus the two additional hypotheses regarding stratification beliefs (H12-H13) for this study examined the diversity course graduation requirements effect on opposition to race-based policy (H2 and H4), racial prejudice and racism (H1 and H3), and stratification beliefs.

In the first study, the specific number of diversity courses completed was taken into account to address the extent to which how much diversity course exposure impacted students' racial attitudes. One-Way ANOVAs of the mean levels of opposition to race-based policy, the social psychological and social structural measures of racial prejudice and racism indicate that the mean levels do not differ significantly by the number of diversity courses completed. Even the mean levels of opposition to race-based policy, symbolic racism, threat, classical racism, and stratification beliefs of those students who fulfilled the university's diversity course graduation requirement do not differ significantly from those students who had not taken any diversity courses. Based on these findings in the first study, it was

concluded that the diversity course graduation requirements failed to have an affect on opposition to race-based policy, racial prejudice and racism.

However, given the course variability in the first study, that is—most of the courses randomly selected did not focus on issues of race and racism—it was concluded that the findings most likely underestimate the potential of race-based courses for reducing racial prejudice and racism. Therefore, a second study was conducted to examine only the educational effect of race-based courses on racial attitudes. In addition, other mediating factors (e.g., racial climate, racial controversies, testing effect etc.) could possibly have an effect on racial attitudes. So in order to take into account some of these mediating factors, a repeated (pre/post) design was employed for a more precise examination of racial attitude change across time. Furthermore, the first study did not examine students' racial attitudes who had already fulfilled their diversity requirement and who were taking additional diversity courses. The purpose of the first study was to specifically examine how the Midwest university's diversity course graduation requirements impact racial attitudes and opposition to race-based policy. In this case, there were only two possibilities to examine. First, completing only one U.S. or International perspectives course partially fulfilled the Midwest university's diversity course graduation requirement; and second, completing a combination of the two completely fulfilled the diversity requirements for graduation.

However, an attempt was made to examine the racial attitudes of those students who went beyond what the Midwest university required for graduation. In the second study a comparison was made of those students who had already fulfilled their diversity requirement and were taking an additional race-based course with those students who have not fulfilled the requirement. The first paired t-test results show that there are no significant differences

in the mean levels of racial prejudice and racism between time 1 and time 2 for those students only completing one race-based course. Some students received a "placebo" questionnaire rather than the pretest to determine if a testing effect existed. There were no significant differences found between those students who completed the pretest and those that did not. Thus, a testing effect was not found. However, since the control group (receivers of the placebo) was not randomly selected, the results should be interpreted with extreme caution.

However, the quasi-experimental design turned out to be an important procedure because the results of the independent samples t-tests show that those students who had already fulfilled their diversity requirement started their race-based course with lower levels of symbolic racism than those who just started their first race-based course. In addition, the independent samples t-test results show that those students who had already fulfilled the diversity requirement and were about to complete an additional course have lower levels of symbolic racism, are more likely to believe that racial discrimination exists as a residual effect of generations of slavery, and support race-based policy. However, due to the possibility of selection bias, a definite conclusion could not be made in the sense that the course content was primarily responsible for improving racial attitudes among those students who had already fulfilled the diversity course requirement and were completing an additional race-based course. For the purposes of this study, selection bias means that those students who were less prejudiced were more open to and interested in learning more about race relations and so they were taking additional diversity courses to satisfy their interests.

The third empirical goal of this study was to examine and compare the predictive powers of all the predictors (i.e., socio-demographic characteristics, political/racial attitudes,

and diversity course requirement exposure) on stratification beliefs, opposition to race-based policy, symbolic racism, threat, and classical racism. Stepwise regression was employed since the intent was to allow the variables to enter the regression equation upon meeting statistical criteria and to be deleted at any step where they no longer contributed to the overall prediction. Because this study proposed that these White undergraduate students will more likely believe that the American system is fair and will promote individualism rather than racial group dominance, a third set of hypotheses (H8-H11 and H14) was constructed that primarily examined what predicts symbolic racism and opposition to race-based policy. In addition, to account for the stratification beliefs measure, hypothesis (H14) was constructed based on the findings of recent research regarding the relationship between egalitarianism and symbolic racism.

The stepwise regression analyses show that the socio-demographic predictors did not play a dominant role in accounting for variations in opposition to race-based policy, stratification beliefs, symbolic racism, threat, and classical racism. What's most interesting is that Table 1 in Appendix E shows that out of all of the political and racial predictors, egalitarianism was found to be a very strong predictor of all five of the dependent measures. Even more revealing, egalitarianism was the strongest predictor for almost every one of the dependent measures except for symbolic racism. As expected, the stepwise regression results revealed that egalitarianism negatively predicted symbolic racism, threat, classical racism, and stratification beliefs. This finding underscores the complexity of measuring and conceptualizing the racial ideologies of symbolic racism and laissez faire racism as contemporary expressions of racial prejudice and racism. That is, consistent with prior research, the finding of the strong negative effect of egalitarianism on opposition to race-

based policy, racial prejudice and racism supports the argument that racial prejudice and racism are intertwined with core American values like egalitarianism (Bobo et al., 2000; Sears et al., 2000).

However, as also seen in Table 1 in Appendix E, there were a few specific instances where gender, rural, and father's graduate degree were found to play a role albeit not as dominant, in explaining the variation in racial prejudice and racism. For example, gender was found to have a significant positive effect on threat. The gender effect on threat suggests that men are more likely than women to feel threatened by Black competition for jobs and housing. In contrast, in their study on gender differences in white racial attitudes, Hughes and Tuch (2003) found that women and men tended to be similar to men in establishing social distance from Blacks. Therefore, Hughes and Tuch (2003) concluded that their findings do not support the gender socialization thesis— that women are socialized to be more empathetic and caring towards others than are men.

Furthermore, Bonilla-Silva (2003), and Hughes and Tuch (2003) contend that since Whites occupy the position of racial dominance in the hierarchy, men and women are more likely to hold similar racial attitudes. As pointed out above, the findings of this study regarding the gender effect on threat call into question this theoretical assumption that men and women hold similar racial attitudes. However, it must be noted that the findings of this study do reveal that there are no gender differences in students' symbolic racist attitudes, stratification beliefs, opposition to race-based policy, and classical racism when all the variables are accounted for in the regression models. Thus, these findings may offer some support to the social structural theoretical approach to racial prejudice and racism in that

white women's and white men's racial attitudes are rooted in their shared sense of racial group dominance.

In addition, it is interesting to note that rural has a moderate significant positive effect on threat. Although the findings on the rural effect are not very strong, these findings are consistent with past sociological research on racial attitudes and segregation that has revealed that those who live in urban areas are more comfortable with racial integration than people from suburban areas (Farely et al., 1994; Pettigrew, 1997). In contrast, father's graduate degree was found to have a negative effect, albeit marginal, on threat. Those students with fathers with a master's degree or a Ph.D. are less likely to feel threatened by Blacks. These findings underscore the importance of higher educational attainment in improving racial attitudes (Farely et al., 1994).

As expected and consistent with prior research on the origins of symbolic racism, economic individualism and anti-Black affect were shown to positively predict symbolic racism (Sears et al., 1997). What is most interesting is that negative stereotypes were found to have a much stronger impact on symbolic racism than affective prejudice. Both the research on symbolic racism and laissez-faire racism indicate that the negative stereotypes that Whites' harbor towards Blacks have their roots in the Jim Crow era (Bobo et al., 1997; Sears et al., 1997). Indeed, the findings of this study indicate that threat, classical racism, and symbolic racism all share in common and are influenced by an anti-Black affect—negative stereotypes.

However, although the bivariate correlations of symbolic racism, threat, and classical racism are correlated and that negative stereotypes fit the anti-Black affect for each measure of racial prejudice and racism, there are distinct differences between them. The most

noticeable distinction is that economic individualism only predicts symbolic racism, not threat and classical racism. This finding suggests that those students who espouse symbolic racism ideology are more likely to believe that hard work guarantees social and economic success for Blacks. Furthermore, the existence of economic individualism as the strongest predictor in conjunction with the significant negative effect of egalitarianism and positive effect of anti-Black affect could suggest that there may be a tendency for these undergraduate students to believe that society has gone too far in providing equal opportunities for Blacks to the point where Blacks are making illegitimate demands on the racial status quo. In addition, political conservatism, although not as strong, only positively predicts symbolic racism. These findings clearly suggest that there is a difference between the social psychological (symbolic racism) and social structural measures of racial prejudice and racism (threat and classical racism).

It is also interesting to point out that egalitarianism was found to be the strongest predictor in the negative direction for threat and classical racism followed by the significant positive effect of negative stereotypes. Here the argument could be made that those students who believe that society should not have any responsibility in promoting equal treatment and equal opportunities for Blacks are more likely to feel threatened by Blacks and superior over them. In fact, doing so would jeopardize their dominant racial position in the social structure (Bobo, 2000; Bobo et al., 1997). Indeed, consistent with prior research, the empirical fact that economic individualism does not predict threat and classical racism suggests that in accordance with the social structural theoretical approach to racial racism and prejudice, threat and classical racism tap the social structural dynamics of competition and racial group dominance (Bobo et al., 1997; Sears et al., 1997).

The stepwise regression analysis for opposition to race-based policy clearly indicates that egalitarianism, affective prejudice, and economic individualism are the dominant cues governing students' opposition to race-based policy. Contrary to prior research this study found that affective prejudice significantly predicts opposition to race-based policy rather than negative stereotypes (Bobo et al., 1997; Sears et al., 1997). This is an important finding because what this seems to suggest is that those students who are opposed to race-based policy are less likely to feel sympathetic toward Blacks because the opportunity structure is fair and that achieving social and economic success depends on one's own efforts.

Furthermore, the fact that egalitarianism, affective prejudice, and economic individualism are also the dominant cues in predicting stratification beliefs could also support why students are not supporting race-based policy. Recall that stratification beliefs measure the extent to which students believe that the opportunity structure is fair for Blacks. Therefore, those students who seldom feel sympathy for Blacks are more likely to believe that racism and racial discrimination are relics of the past. Hence, race-based policies are not needed to help Blacks achieve social and economic success.

The second set of hypotheses (H5-H7) relate to the possible moderating influences of interracial friendship and political conservatism on the diversity course graduation requirements-racial prejudice and racism relationship. First, for interracial friendship it was expected that its interaction with diversity course exposure would result in a moderating effect on racial prejudice and racism (hypothesis 5). Contrary to what was expected, none of the tests for interactions proved to be significant. Taken at face value, it appears that interracial friendship does not play a role in improving racial attitudes. However, it should be noted that the racial prejudice and racism variables used in this study only measured

attitudes and beliefs about Blacks. The interracial friendship measure, on the other hand, was not limited to Blacks but also included other racial groups such as Native Americans and Asian Americans. Furthermore, the interracial friendship measure did not specify what kind of interracial relationship was formed. Perhaps a better way to approach this would have been to single out only Black and White interracial friendships and then examine how these friendships influenced students' racial attitudes.

Secondly, for political conservatism, it was expected that its interaction with diversity course exposure would result in a moderating effect on racial prejudice and racism (hypothesis 6). Interestingly, the interaction term of political conservatism and diversity course exposure was found to have a small moderating effect only on symbolic racism (table 15). That is, for conservatives, taking diversity courses only increases their symbolic racist beliefs. This finding is consistent with previous research that has pointed out that education imparts an ideology of individualism that reinforces the notion that social and economic success depend on one's own efforts (Jackman and Muha, 1984; Phelan et al., 1995). However, after controlling for the other political and racial predictors of symbolic racism, the interaction effect of political conservatism and diversity course exposure was not found to be statistically significant (Table 15a).

In addition, contrary to what was expected in hypothesis 7 that suggested that political conservatism would moderate the direct relationship between diversity course exposure and opposition to race-based policy, the interaction term of political conservatism and diversity course exposure did not have a moderating effect on opposition to race-based policy.

CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSIONS

Given the primary and unique secondary socialization experiences of the undergraduate students due to higher education and the post civil rights laws, this study proposed that students are more likely to believe that the American opportunity structure is fair, and free from racial discrimination. While the overall mean levels of the five dependent measures of opposition to race-based policy, racial prejudice and racism show empirical support for this proposition as evidenced by the higher mean levels of stratification beliefs and symbolic racism, there were some striking discoveries that captured both the cognitive and affective dispositions that predict all five criterion variables. But before this will be discussed in greater detail below, it must be pointed out that based on the aforementioned proposition an attempt was made to examine the impact of a Midwest university's diversity course graduation requirements on racial attitudes.

The findings of the t-tests in the first study did not support the first set of hypotheses (H1-H4) that suggest that those students who have completed either one or fulfilled their diversity course graduation requirements are less likely to oppose race-based policy and express racial prejudice and racism. On the other hand, what's interesting is that the quasi-experimental findings in the second study did reveal that those students who had already fulfilled their diversity course graduation requirement and were about to complete an additional race-based diversity course were more likely to believe that racial discrimination existed (stratification beliefs), expressed lower levels of symbolic racism, and were more likely to support race-based policy. However, a word of warning in interpreting the significant results of the second study is warranted here. That is— those students who took an additional race-based course after they had already fulfilled the Midwest university's

diversity graduation requirement may have had specific interests in learning about race and ethnic relations in the United States. Therefore, those students' responses to the questions pertaining to race and race-based policy in the questionnaire may largely reflect the unique interests of these students.

The stepwise results in the first study seem quite clear in that the political and racial predictors dominate the socio-demographic characteristics in terms of bivariate correlations, standardized beta coefficients, and in their capacity for explaining the variation in all five criterion variables. More specifically, however, the third set of hypotheses (H8-H11) for this study examined how economic individualism, anti-Black affect, and egalitarianism predicted racial prejudice and racism especially symbolic racism and opposition to race-based policy. Overall, consistent with the strong positive bivariate correlation between economic individualism and symbolic racism, the stepwise regression results showed that economic individualism did positively predict symbolic racism as hypothesis 8 had suggested. This finding is consistent with the results of previous studies on symbolic racism in the sense that those who embraced the protestant work ethic and believed that America is a land of opportunity were more likely to blame Blacks themselves for not "trying hard" enough to pull themselves out of poverty (Sears et al., 2000).

However, what is most interesting is that although it was hypothesized that an anti-Black affect would predict symbolic racism in the positive direction (hypothesis 9), it was not anticipated that the anti-Black affect of negative stereotypes was much stronger than the anti-Black affect of affective prejudice in predicting symbolic racism, threat, and classical racism. Interestingly, the reverse happened in predicting stratification beliefs and opposition to race-based policy such that the anti-Black affect of affective prejudice was the stronger

predictor of stratification beliefs and opposition to race based policy. In fact, the anti-Black affect of negative stereotypes was excluded from the overall regression models predicting stratification beliefs and opposition to race-based policy because it was not significant. These findings seem to suggest that the affective disposition of the anti-Black affect (i.e., affective prejudice) rather than the cognitive disposition (i.e., negative stereotypes) plays a much more important role in predicting opposition to race-based policy and stratification beliefs.

Furthermore, although hypothesis 10 suggests that egalitarianism would be negatively related to racial prejudice and racism, it was a surprise to find that the stepwise regression results revealed that a lack of egalitarianism was the strongest predictor for almost all of the criterion variables of racial prejudice and racism except for symbolic racism. Although this lack of egalitarianism is so widespread in predicting both racial ideologies—i.e., symbolic racism and laissez-faire racism—it is important to keep in mind that prior research has shown that there are distinctive differences in how lack of egalitarianism is expressed to maintain symbolic racist and laissez-faire racist ideologies (Bobo 2000; Sears et al., 2000).

For example, in accordance with the laissez-faire racism approach, a negative effect of egalitarianism on threat could reflect that those students who believe that society should not be responsible for creating more equal opportunities are more likely to feel threatened by Black competition for housing, employment, and political positions. In addition, a negative effect of egalitarianism on classical racism as evidenced by the stepwise regression results could reflect that those students who resist societal efforts to create more equal opportunities are more likely to believe that Whites are the dominant racial group in the social structure.

However, in contrast, according to the symbolic racist ideology, the lack of egalitarianism effect on symbolic racism could mean that although students believe in the abstract principle of equality, societal efforts to increase equality for Blacks are more likely to cause resentment toward Blacks in the sense that Blacks are not trying hard enough to succeed without any preferential treatment.

Indeed, along similar lines, the very strong negative bivariate correlation between egalitarianism and stratification beliefs and the negative standardized beta coefficient of egalitarianism predicting stratification beliefs provided qualified support for hypothesis 14 that hypothesized that egalitarianism would negatively predict stratification beliefs. These findings seem to suggest that those undergraduate students who are more inclined to believe that society should not be responsible for creating more equal opportunities are more likely to believe that the opportunity structure for Blacks is fair and free from structural conditions (e.g., institutional discrimination) that would hinder Blacks from making social and economic progress.

Furthermore, hypothesis 11 suggested that the strongest predictors of symbolic racism would be the strongest predictors of opposition to race-based policy (hypothesis 11). However, contrary to what was hypothesized, the stepwise regression analyses revealed that egalitarianism and affective prejudice are the strongest predictors of opposition to race-based policy rather than economic individualism and negative stereotypes which along with egalitarianism are the strongest predictors of symbolic racism (see Appendix E).

It is clear from the mean level findings of this study as evidenced by the significant mean level differences between classical racism and symbolic racism that students rejected feelings of racial superiority over Blacks and did not express a desire to maintain their

dominant position in the social structure as the social dominance orientation and laissez-faire theoretical perspective purport (Sidanius and Pratto, 1999; Bobo et al., 1997). Rightly so, purporting such a supremacist ideology would have been unacceptable and directly opposed to the values and mission of the Midwest university they were attending or better yet the American Creed enshrined in the Declaration of Independence. However, consistent with prior research on the nature of racial prejudice and racism, the findings do reveal that racial prejudice and racism is expressed in more subtle ways (Bonilla-Silva, 2003; Bobo, 2000; Sears and Henry, 2003). Consequently, racial conflicts and controversies have been on the rise at predominantly White colleges and university all over the nation (Bonilla-Silva, 2003; Feagin, 1996).

Such racial incidents have led sociologists and social scientists alike to theoretically conceptualize the nature of contemporary expressions of racial prejudice and racism. Even more, sociologists and educators are implementing new pedagogical techniques into their curriculum that are designed to combat these subtle expressions of racial prejudice and racism. However, there is a considerable amount of disagreement among sociologists and psychologists about how these subtle forms of racial prejudice and racism are expressed and perpetuated over time.

Furthermore, although sociologists and psychologists have done well to theoretically conceptualize the contemporary nature of racial prejudice and racism as social psychological and social structural dimensions, too much emphasis is placed on how different these social psychological and social structural conceptualizations are. Consequently, there's a tendency to focus on these racial attitudes as if they were static (i.e., the White population as whole expresses either the social psychological or the social structural dimension) rather than

viewing them as a dynamic process that influence each other and is ever changing. The dynamic process referred to here is how the social structural dimension (macro level of reality) effects the social psychological dimension (micro level of reality) and vice versa.

Thus, for the purposes of this study, a micro/macro analytical framework was conceptualized and employed to take into account how certain key racial dimensions of the social structure (i.e., higher education, racial residential segregation, and the government) have influenced and shaped the social psychological racial dimension of White undergraduate students at a Midwest university. The study was a departure from previous studies that call into question the effect that education has on reducing racial prejudice and racism by making the case that White undergraduate students are a unique subgroup of the White population due to the nature of their secondary socialization exposure— i.e., diversity values and mission of higher education and post civil rights laws— pressuring students to conform to traditional conservative principles of individualism and abstract equality.

Are racial attitudes and beliefs changing for the better? This study argues that racial attitudes are possibly changing in the abstract, but not in practice. In other words, these undergraduate students' world view is overshadowed by the illusion of moral and ethical principles rather than reality—i.e., there is a strong belief in what ought to be rather than what is. The stepwise results in the first study that show that economic individualism and egalitarianism are the dominant predictors in their capacity for explaining the variation in symbolic racism could offer support to the argument that somehow American core values and principles such as egalitarianism and economic individualism play a role in perpetuating symbolic racist ideology. In addition, the stepwise results also show that egalitarianism negatively predicts stratification beliefs thereby suggesting that those students who believe in

the abstract principle of equality are less likely to believe that the opportunity structure is fair and free from structural barriers that prevent Blacks from making social and economic progress.

Interestingly, as evidenced by the mean levels of stratification beliefs and opposition to race based policy, although students were more likely to believe that society has a social responsibility to ensure equality for everyone, they were less likely to support race-based policy to eradicate racial inequality. In addition, there was a tendency to blame Blacks themselves for not living up to the standards of the American Creed as evidenced by the existence of an anti-Black affect in the form of negative stereotypes. Furthermore, the students' stratification beliefs were more likely to indicate that the opportunity structure is fair and free from any structural conditions (e.g., institutional discrimination) that would prevent Blacks from achieving social and economic success.

It is interesting to mention that the quasi-experimental findings of the second study could lend support to the necessity of requiring undergraduate students to take race-based courses that challenge their prejudicial views and assumptions about Blacks in particular. However, since this study did not test for selection bias and other possible intervening variables, the results of the impact of race-based courses should be interpreted with extreme caution.

American universities and colleges have taken different approaches to making race-based courses that focus on race and racism an integral part of their general education program. As odd as this may sound, even though the predominantly White Midwest university in this study had implemented diversity course graduation requirements into its general education program to help prepare their students to meet the challenges of racial diversity, students did not have to take race-based courses to fulfill the university's diversity graduation requirement. In other words, students were not required to take courses that

challenge their preconceived notions of Blacks. Rather, students were given the option to choose from a list of a wide array of courses that did not necessarily pertain to issues of race and racism. Thus, students could graduate from this Midwest university without completing race-based courses that critically examine issues of race and racism in U.S. contemporary society.

This Midwest university's current approach to implementing the U.S. and International diversity course requirements is too broad in its scope and too general in its application to have any substantial effect on improving racial attitudes. Although the university's mission is to provide students with insights that enhance their understanding of diversity among people in the U.S. and on a global scale, the underlying issues of race and racism particularly the affective and cognitive dimensions of racial prejudice are not addressed and critically examined on a level that is required to foster interracial cooperation and understanding in the U.S. and beyond.

In addition, treating the U.S. and International diversity course requirements as separate dimensions and requiring students to complete both requirements separately may not be helpful in critically examining the affective and cognitive dimensions of racial prejudice. Rather, a multidimensional approach that is cross-disciplinary and embraces both international and domestic issues and the underlying dimensions of ethnocentrism and racism could provide students with the essential insights needed to take on the seemingly insurmountable challenges that we face in this post 9/11 era we find ourselves living in.

The samples in both studies were comprised of students who came from mostly white communities and thus had very little, if any interracial contact while growing up. Past research on racial segregation has shown that one of the major reasons why students have had very little interracial contact while growing up is because their communities are not racially integrated due to racial residential segregation (Massey and Denton, 1993). Consequently, if students are not socialized to have a conscious awareness of their privileged racial status in comparison with Blacks and other racial groups, then they are more likely to believe that the opportunity structure is open and fair, *ceteris paribus*, and thus are unlikely to support the implementation of race-based policies to help eradicate racial inequality. In other words, implementing race-based initiatives without regard to individual qualifications is seen as unfair and in the long run is believed to jeopardize American principles such as the work ethic, individualism, and meritocracy that sustain an economically prosperous society.

Limitations of both studies should be addressed in future research. First, both studies only examined prejudicial and racist attitudes towards Blacks. Diversity course requirements are not limited to the African American experience in the United States and so racial prejudice and racist attitudes toward other racial groups should also be assessed. Second, the data in both studies were collected at only one university, which has its own unique approach to implementing diversity requirements. Consequently, the findings of these studies are unique to this predominantly White Midwest university and thus cannot be generalized to other institutions. Studies that assess the impact of diversity course graduation requirements at many colleges and universities would be far more useful for colleges and universities who are interested in implementing diversity course requirements into their curricula.

Third, in the second study, the control and experimental groups were not randomly assigned and so definitive conclusions could not be made about the educational impact of the race-based courses on students' racial perceptions. In addition, what students learn in these courses could be mediated by other factors such as the instructor's race, the disciplinary approach, the racial composition of students enrolled in the class, and selection bias.

Fourth, although survey studies are useful in gathering information on respondents' views and opinions about race and race relations, they are severely limited tools for examining the reasons why people answer or respond the way they do (Bonilla-Silva, 2003). For example, the survey questions in this study were primarily based on a five-point Likert scale format where respondents answered to what extent they "disagree" or "agree" to questions. Furthermore, because of the social condemnation of racial prejudice and stereotypes, there could be a tendency for students to overlook their real feelings about Blacks and provide answers that are consistent with public norms regarding race (Bonilla-Silva, 2003). Therefore, mix mode data collection techniques (qualitative interviews and survey questions) are highly encouraged to provide an opportunity to go more into depth with the reasons why people answer the questions the way they do.

Future research that addresses these limitations will provide very valuable curricular insights into how universities can implement diversity course requirements into their curricula to reduce racial prejudice and improve interracial understanding.

APPENDIX A: WEB SURVEY

Race relations and diversity in the beginning of the 21st century

Thanks for helping me with this survey on race relations and diversity in the beginning of the 21st century. Understanding students' experiences and opinions will help Iowa State University's efforts to prepare students to work in a complex diverse society. You are part of a carefully selected sample that has been asked to assist with this survey, and I appreciate your assistance. As with all surveys conducted, your responses are confidential. If you prefer to fill-out a paper questionnaire, please contact me immediately. Should you have any difficulties in responding please e-mail me at shoghi@iastate.edu or call at 294-8012.

To begin, type in your survey code that you received in class in the box to the right.

Next, click the **START** button to go to the first question of the survey.

Your responses are very much appreciated. Start

Race relations and diversity in the beginning of the 21st century

Thanks for helping me with this survey on race relations and diversity in the beginning of the 21st century. Understanding students' experiences and opinions will help Iowa State University's efforts to prepare students to work in a complex diverse society. You are part of a carefully selected sample that has been asked to assist with this survey, and I appreciate your assistance. As with all surveys conducted, your responses are confidential. If you prefer to fill-out a paper questionnaire, please contact me immediately. Should you have any difficulties in responding please e-mail me at shoghi@iastate.edu or call at 294-8012.

To begin, type in your survey code that you received in class in the box to the right.

Next, click the **START** button to go to the first question of the survey.

Your responses are very much appreciated. Start

Start Here

Start Here: Please answer the following questions about yourself by using the mouse to click on your choice. If you make a mistake, click on the correct choice and the previous answer will disappear.

1-2. Before you came to college, indicate for each category how many friends you had who are of a different nationality (or from a different country) and race (e.g., African American, Asian American, Native American, etc.).

	Zero	One	Two	Three	Four or more
1. Nationality	○	○	○	○	○
2. Race	○	○	○	○	○

Instructions for answering questions #3-5: Click on the downward pointing triangle to the right of the selection box and a list of possible response options will appear. Move the mouse down or up to select your response. Click on your response and your response will appear in the selection box window.

3. My religious preference is: [▼]

4. The influence of religion on my life has been: [▼]

5. Which political party do you consider yourself to be affiliated with? [▼] If you answer other, please specify by typing in your response in the selection box

6. We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives. I'm going to show you a seven-point scale on which the political views that people might hold are arranged from extremely liberal—point 1 to extremely conservative— point 7. Where would you place yourself on this scale?

Extremely liberal	Liberal	Slightly liberal	Moderate, middle of the road	Slightly conservative	Conservative	Extremely conservative
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Start Here

7-14. For each of the eight social settings in your life, indicate the level of racial composition.

	All non-Whites	Mostly non-Whites	About half non-Whites	Mostly Whites	Almost all Whites	Never in social setting
7. Grammar or elementary school	○	○	○	○	○	○
8. Junior high school	○	○	○	○	○	○
9. High School	○	○	○	○	○	○
10. College	○	○	○	○	○	○
11. Neighborhood while growing up	○	○	○	○	○	○
12. Present neighborhood	○	○	○	○	○	○
13. Church or place of worship usually attended	○	○	○	○	○	○
14. Present workplace, if employed	○	○	○	○	○	○

15-16. After entering college, indicate for each category how many friends you have gained who are of a different nationality (or from a different country) and race (e.g., African American, Asian American, Native American, etc.)

	Zero	One	Two	Three	Four or more
15. Nationality	○	○	○	○	○
16. Race	○	○	○	○	○

Start Here

17-20. Which of the following hypothetical objects, statements or events do you have a positive or a negative feeling towards?

	Very positive	Somewhat positive	Neither positive or negative	Somewhat negative	Very negative
17. A Black supervisor	○	○	○	○	○
18. Racial equality	○	○	○	○	○
19. White superiority	○	○	○	○	○
20. Each ethnic group should stay in its own place	○	○	○	○	○

21-22. How often have you ever felt the following ways about Blacks?

	Very often	Fairly often	Not too often	Hardly ever	Never
21. How often have you felt sympathy for Blacks?	○	○	○	○	○
22. How often have you felt admiration for Blacks?	○	○	○	○	○

23-26. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
23. More good jobs for Blacks means fewer good jobs for members of other groups.	○	○	○	○	○
24. The more influence Blacks have in local politics the less influence members of other groups will have in local politics.	○	○	○	○	○
25. As more good housing and neighborhoods go to Blacks, the fewer good houses and neighborhoods there will be for members of other groups.	○	○	○	○	○
26. Many Blacks have been trying to get ahead economically at the expense of other groups.	○	○	○	○	○

27-30. I will provide a list of reasons some people give to explain why there are poor people in this country. Please tell me whether you feel each of these is very important, somewhat important, or not important in explaining why there are poor people in this country.

	Very Important	Somewhat important	Not important
27. Failure of society to provide good schools for many Americans.	○	○	○
28. Loose morals and drunkenness.	○	○	○
29. Failure of industry to provide enough jobs.	○	○	○
30. Lack of effort by the poor themselves.	○	○	○

31-33. On average Blacks have worse jobs, income, and housing than White people. Do you think these differences are...

	Yes	No
31. Mainly due to discrimination?	○	○
32. Because most Blacks don't have the chance for education that it takes to rise out of poverty?	○	○
33. Because most Blacks just don't have the motivation or will power to pull themselves up out of poverty?	○	○

Start Here

34-43. Please indicate where you think most Whites and Blacks fall along each of the following scales of opposites:

34-35. For each of the following pairs of opposites, indicate where 1 is Hard working and 7 is Lazy.

34. Whites:								
Hard working	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	**Lazy**
35. Blacks:								
Hard working	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	**Lazy**

36-37. For each of the following pairs of opposites, indicate where 1 is Not violence prone and 7 is Violence prone.

36. Whites:								
Not Violence-prone	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	**Violence-prone**
37. Blacks:								
Not Violence-prone	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	**Violence-prone**

38-39. For each of the following pairs of opposites, indicate where 1 is Intelligent and 7 is Unintelligent.

38. Whites:								
Intelligent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	**Unintelligent**
39. Blacks:								
Intelligent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	**Unintelligent**

Start Here

40-41. For each of the following pairs of opposites, indicate where 1 is Self-supporting and 7 is Live off Welfare.

40. Whites								
Self-supporting	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	**Live off Welfare**
41. Black								
Self-supporting	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	**Live off Welfare**

42-43. For each of the following pairs of opposites, indicate where 1 is Patriotic and 7 is Unpatriotic.

42. Whites:								
Patriotic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	**Unpatriotic**
43. Blacks:								
Patriotic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	**Unpatriotic**

Start Here

44-55. Indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
44. Most Blacks who receive money from welfare programs could get along without it if they tried.	○	○	○	○	○
45. Irish, Italians, Jewish, and many other minorities overcame prejudice and worked their way up. Blacks should do the same without any special favors.	○	○	○	○	○
46. It's really a matter of some people not trying hard enough; if Blacks would only try harder, they could be just as well off as Whites.	○	○	○	○	○
47. America is a land of opportunity in which you need only to work hard to succeed.	○	○	○	○	○
48. Our society should do whatever is necessary to make sure that everyone has an equal opportunity to succeed.	○	○	○	○	○
49. We have gone too far in pushing equal rights in this country.	○	○	○	○	○
50. One of the big problems in this country is that we don't give everyone an equal chance.	○	○	○	○	○
51. This country would be better off if we worried less about how equal people are.	○	○	○	○	○
52. It is not really that big of a problem if some people have more of a chance in life than others.	○	○	○	○	○
53. If people were treated more equally in this country, we would have many fewer problems.	○	○	○	○	○
54. Over the past few years, Blacks have gotten less than they deserve.	○	○	○	○	○
55. Generations of slavery and discrimination have created conditions that make it difficult for Blacks to work their way out of the lower class.	○	○	○	○	○

Start Here

56-58. Here are some things that the government in Washington might do to deal with the problems of poverty and unemployment among Black Americans. I would like you to tell me if you would strongly favor it, favor it, neither favor it nor oppose it, oppose it, or strongly oppose it?

	Strongly favor	Favor	Neither favor nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
56. Giving business and industry special tax breaks for locating in largely Black areas.	○	○	○	○	○
57. Spending more money on schools in Black neighborhoods, especially for pre-school and early education programs.	○	○	○	○	○
58. Provide special college scholarships for Black children who maintain good grades.	○	○	○	○	○

59-74. The following are some questions about Iowa State University's diversity graduation requirements.

	Yes	No (If you answered NO, skip questions #60-64 and go to #65).
59. Have you met Iowa State University's diversity graduation requirements?	○	○

	1998	1999	2000	2001
60. If you answered yes for #59, in what **year** did you complete the diversity graduation requirements?	○	○	○	○

61. What U.S. diversity course did you complete that counted towards meeting the diversity graduation requirement? **Click on the downward pointing triangle to the right of the selection box and a list of possible response items will appear. If the number and title of the course does not appear as a choice option, then type in the department, number and title of the course where it states "OTHER COURSE".**

▼ If you choose OTHER COURSES, please type the department, number, and title of the course.

62. In what **year** did you complete the U.S. diversity course that counted towards meeting the diversity graduation requirement?	○	○	○	○

63. What International Perspectives course did you complete that counted towards meeting the diversity graduation requirement? Follow the same **CLICK HERE** instructions as you did for U.S. diversity.

▼ If you choose OTHER COURSES, please type the department, number, and title of the course.

64. In what **year** did you complete the International Perspectives course that counted towards meeting the diversity graduation requirement? After answering this question, skip questions #65-74 and go to #75.	○	○	○	○

Start Here

	Yes	No (If you answered **NO**, skip questions #66-67 and go to #68).
65. Have you completed any U.S. diversity course that counted towards meeting the diversity requirement (i.e., completed any three credit courses in U.S. diversity)?	○	○

	1998	1999	2000	2001
66. If you answered yes for #65, in what **year** did you complete the diversity graduation requirements?	○	○	○	○

67. What U.S. diversity course did you complete in the year you specified in question #66? **Click on the downward pointing triangle to the right of the selection box and a list of possible response items will appear. If the number and title of the course does not appear as a choice option, then type in the department, number and title of the course where it states "OTHER COURSE".**

[▼] If you choose OTHER COURSES, please type the department, number, and title of the course in the space provided.

	Yes	No (If you answered **NO**, skip questions #69-70 and go to #71).
68. Have you completed any courses that counted towards meeting the International Perspectives requirement (i.e., completed any three credit course in International Perspectives)?	○	○

	1998	1999	2000	2001
69. If you answered yes for #68, in what **year** did you complete the International Perspectives course?	○	○	○	○

70. What International Perspectives course did you complete that counted towards meeting the diversity graduation requirement? Follow the same instructions as you did for U.S. diversity.

[▼] If you choose OTHER COURSES, please type the department, number, and title of the course in the space provided.

Start Here

	Yes	No (If you answered **NO**, skip question #72 and go to #73).
71. Are you currently enrolled in a U.S. diversity course to meet the U.S. diversity requirement?	○	○

72. If you answered yes to question #71, What U.S. diversity course are you currently enrolled in this semester? **Click on the downward pointing triangle to the right of the selection box and a list of possible response items will appear. If the number and title of the course does not appear as a choice option, then type in the department, number and title of the course where it states "OTHER COURSE".**

[▼] If you choose OTHER COURSES, please type the department, number, and title of the course in the space provided.

	Yes	No (If you answered **NO**, skip question #74 and go to #75).
73. Are you currently enrolled in an International Perspectives course to meet the International Perspectives requirement?	○	○

74. If you answered yes to question #73, what International Perspectives course are you currently enrolled in this semester? **Click on the downward pointing triangle to the right of the selection box and a list of possible response items will appear. If the number and title of the course does not appear as a choice option, then type in the department, number and title of the course where it states "OTHER COURSE".**

[▼] If you choose OTHER COURSES please type number and title of courses in the space provided

Start Here

75-85. Please answer the following questions about yourself.

75. Your sex — Male ○ Female ○

76. In what year were you born? 19

77. To what ethnic group do you belong?

78. What is your present class standing?

79. What is your GPA (Grade Point Average in the following range. If this your first semester in college, please leave this blank):

80. What is your current residence?

81. College or department you are enrolled in or most likely will enroll in if undeclared:

82. What is the HIGHEST LEVEL of education completed by your FATHER?

83. What is the HIGHEST LEVEL of education completed by your MOTHER

84. Roughly estimate your parents' annual income before taxes:

85. Which of the following terms best describes your hometown?

Thank you for your participation in completing this survey. If you have any additional thoughts or comments regarding any of the information presented in this survey, please share them below (Note: your comments will remain confidential).

Submit | Reset

APPENDIX B: CONSENT AND PARTICIPATION LETTER

Dear student:

My name is Timothy D. Radloff and I am working on my Ph.D. dissertation in Sociology. I am writing to ask you to complete about a 25-minute questionnaire on race relations. This study is an effort to learn about Iowa State students' experiences and opinions about certain aspects related to race relations and diversity in the 21st century. Your participation is voluntary. However, your participation is very important for me to obtain a good understanding of ISU students' experiences and opinions of race relations and diversity.

Your responses to the questionnaires are completely **confidential**. By confidentiality, it is meant that your name will not be associated with your responses to the questionnaires because you will be using a survey code number rather than your name when you submit the questionnaires on-line. Furthermore, my data analysis will be conducted without using any names of any specific individuals. For added security, the web server is password protected and your responses are not saved on the server.

The only time your name will be used will be to verify that you have completed the questionnaires so that you will be able to receive extra credit points and be qualified to win $100.00 in a one-time raffle drawing. At the end of the semester, the raffle drawing will take place and the winner will be notified no later than one week before finals week

To complete the questionnaire on the Internet type the following URL address: http://www.public.iastate.edu/~shoghi/Diversity2001/. Read through the introduction and then type in your survey code #_____. Or if you prefer, you can fill-out a paper questionnaire and return it too your professor in a sealed envelope to ensure confidentiality to your responses. Ask your professor for a paper questionnaire. Questionnaires and envelopes will be available for you in class. Please complete the questionnaire by no later than September 15. When you have completed the questionnaire, print and sign your name below and return this form to your professor. If you fill-out a paper questionnaire, do not put this form in the envelope with the questionnaire.

-Thank you for your participation

Print your name: _____

Your signature:_____

APPENDIX C: VARIABLE CODING AND CONSTRUCTION

Question numbers on the Web survey refer to the variables.

Gender: From question 75. What is your gender? Coded as 0 = female, 1 = male

Parents' income: From question 84: Roughly estimate your parents' annual income.. Since the original response categories were not equal in width, the response categories were recoded by substituting the codes with the midpoints of the interval widths. For example, original response categories include: 1= 0-14,000, 2=15,000-29,999, 3=30,000-39,999, 4= 40,000-49,999,5= 50,000-69,999, and 6= 70,000 or more. Recodes include: 1= 7,500, 2= 22,500, 3 =35,000, 4= 45,000, 5= 60,000, 6= 70,000.

Father's education: From question 82. What is HIGHEST LEVEL of education completed by your FATHER? Originally father's level of education was coded as follows: 1= some grade school, 2= completed grade school, 3= some high school, 4= completed high school, 5= completed high school and also had other training, but not college, e.g., technical, 6= some college, 7 completed college, 8 some graduate work, 9= graduate degree). Level of father's education was recoded into 4 categorical variables to allow for more meaningful comparisons: 1= less than high school (some grade school, completed grade school, some high school) 1= completed high school (completed high school, completed high and had other training but not college, some college), 1= college degree (completed college, some graduate work) 1= graduate degree (graduate degree- M.S., M.A. Ph.D. etc.).

Szhometn: From question 85. Which of the following terms best describes your hometown? Original response categories were reversed coded and included: 1= metropolitan city (50,000), 2= suburban community in metropolitan area, 3= town or small city (2,500 to 49,499), and 4= rural area (town under 2,500 population). Size of hometown was recoded into 4 categorical variables such that 1= rural (under 2,500 population), 1= small cities (2,500 to 49,999 population), 1= suburban, 1= metropolitan (over 50,000 population).

Dcontact: From questions 7-9 and 11-14. For each of the eight social settings in your life, indicate the level of racial composition. Response categories were coded as follows: 1= All non-whites, 2= Mostly non-whites, 3= About half non-whites, 4= Mostly whites, 5= Almost all whites, and 6= Never in social setting. The average was computed to indicate the degree of interracial/cultural contact one has had throughout his/her lifetime. A high score means that respondent's contact has been mostly white while growing up.

Indvlism: From question 47. America is a land of opportunity in which you need only to work hard to succeed. Refers to America as the land of opportunity in terms of work ethic. Response categories were coded as follows 1= Strongly disagree to 5= Strongly agree. A high score means that one only needs to work hard to succeed.

Egalitar: From questions 48-53. 48. Our society should do whatever is necessary to make sure that everyone has an equal opportunity to succeed; 49. We have gone too far in pushing equal rights in this country (reverse coded); 50. One of the big problems in this country is that we don't give everyone an equal chance; 51. This country would be better off if we

worried less about how equal people are (reverse coded); 52. It is not really that big of a problem if some people have more of a chance in life than others (reverse coded); and 53. If people were treated more equally in this country, we would have many fewer problems. Refers to one's belief in the abstract principle of equality. Response categories were coded as follows: 1= Strongly disagree to 5= Strongly agree. A high score means that society should promote the abstract principle of equality.

Diversity course requirement (divrsity and d): From questions 59-74. Originally diversity course requirement refers to what extent the diversity course graduation requirement had been fulfilled. There are two parts. Part 1 indicated that if the diversity course graduation requirement was fulfilled (1= yes, 2= no), then response categories for indicating what type of diversity course were as follows: For U.S. diversity courses, 1= Intro to African American Studies (Af Am 201), 2= Intro to American Indian Studies (Am In 210), 3= Latino/a Experience in U.S. society (Soc 332), 4= Ethnic and Race Relations (Soc 330/Af Am 330), 5= Social Class and Inequality (Soc 331), 6= Multicultural Nonsexist Education (El Ed 406/Sec Ed 406) and 7= Indicated by the respondent. For International Perspectives courses, the response categories included: 1= Introduction to African History I (Af Am 310/Hist 310), 2= Peoples and Cultures (Af Am 325/Anthr 325), 3= Peoples and Cultures of Latin America (Am In 323/Anthr 323), 4= Introduction to International Politics (Pol S 251), 5= Introduction to Western Civilization I (Hist 201), 6= Population Problems and Society (Soc 345), 7= Indicated by the respondent.

Part 2 of the diversity course graduation requirement also used both the U.S. and International Perspectives response categories to indicate whether or not a single course had been completed (1= yes, 2= no) and what type of course was completed.

In order to allow for meaningful comparisons, the response categories of 1= yes and 2= no for both parts 1 and 2 were recoded into categorical variables to indicate the number of diversity courses completed. For example, divrsity refers to 0= no courses completed, 1= completed a single diversity course (either U.S. or International) and 2= fulfilled the university's diversity course graduation requirement. In addition, categories 1 and 2 were collapsed into one category (d) such that 1= diversity course exposure (completed one course or no more than two diversity courses).

Rfriendb: From question 2. Before you came to college, indicate for each category how many friends you had who were of a different race (e.g., African American, Asian American Native American etc.). Refers to the number of interracial friendships before entering college. Response categories included: 0= zero friends of a different race to 4= four or more. The average was computed for question 2 to indicate the average number of interracial friendships that had been established before entering college.

Polorien: From question 6. We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives. I'm going to show you a seven-point scale on which the political views that people might hold are arranged from extremely liberal—point 1 to extremely conservative—point 7. Where do you place yourself on this scale? Refers to self-defined political orientation on seven-point scale. A high score means more conservative.

Aprej: From questions 21-22. How often have you ever felt the following ways about Blacks? 21. How often have you felt sympathy for Blacks and 22. How often have you felt admiration for Blacks. Response categories ranged from 1= Very often to 5= Never. The average was computed for questions 21 and 22. Refers to the absence of positive emotion that Whites feel towards Blacks. A high score means that there is a lack of positive feeling towards Blacks.

Negstype: From questions 34-43. Please indicate where you think most Whites and Blacks fall along each of the following scales of opposites. For each of the following pairs of opposites, indicate where—1is Hard working and 7 is Lazy (34-35); 1 is Not violence prone and 7 is Violence prone (36-37); 1 is Intelligent and 7 Unintelligent (38-39); 1 is Self-supporting and 7 is Live off Welfare (40-41); 1 is Patriotic and 7 is Unpatriotic (42-43). All measures were reversed coded to indicate a high positive score for each positive trait. An average score was computed for both Whites (wstype) and Blacks (bstype). Negstype was computed by subtracting bstype from wstype. A positive score indicates that a valued or positive trait is found more often among Whites and a negative indicates that Blacks possess the valued trait more than Whites.

Factor analysis yielded the following dependent measures of prejudice and racism:

Classical racism: From questions 19 and 20. Which of the following hypothetical objects, statements or events do you have a positive or a negative feeling towards (i.e., 19. White superiority and 20. Each ethnic group should stay in its own place). Response categories were coded as follows: 1= Very negative to 5= Very positive. The average was computed for questions 19 and 20. A high score means respondent is a racist.

Threat: From questions 23-26. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements: 23. More good jobs for Blacks means fewer good jobs for members of other groups; 24. The more influence Blacks have in local politics the less influence members of other groups will have in local politics; 25. As more good housing and neighborhoods go to Blacks, the fewer good houses and neighborhoods there will be for members of other groups; 26. Many Blacks have been trying to get ahead economically at the expense of other groups. Response categories included: 1= Strongly disagree to 5= Strongly agree. The average was computed for questions 23-26. Refers to respondents feeling threatened by racial and minorities making progress. A high score means other racial and minorities group are perceived as a threat.

Symracef: From questions 44-46. Indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. 44. Most Blacks who receive money from welfare programs could get along without if they tried; 45. Irish, Italians, Jewish and many other minorities overcame prejudice and worked their way up. Blacks should do the same without any special efforts; 46. It's really a matter of some people not trying hard enough; if Blacks would only try harder, they could be just as well off as Whites. Response categories ranged from 1= Strongly disagree to 5= Strongly agree The average was computed for questions 44-46. Refers to Blacks not trying hard enough to make social and economic progress. A high score means that Blacks need to make more of an effort.

Stratb: From questions 54 and 55. Indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. 54. Over the past few years, Blacks have gotten less than they deserve; 55. Generations of slavery and discrimination have created conditions that make it difficult for Blacks to work their way out of the lower class. Original response categories ranged from 1= Strongly disagree to 5= Strongly agree. Response categories were reversed coded to refer to Whites stratification beliefs about Blacks. The average was computed fro questions 54-55. A high score means that the opportunity structure is fair and free from structural conditions that prevent Blacks from making social and economic progress.

Racepoly: From questions 56-58. Here are some things that the government in Washington might do to deal with the problems of poverty and unemployment among Black Americans. I would like you to tell me if you would strongly favor it, favor it, neither favor it nor oppose it, oppose it, strongly oppose. 56. Giving business and industry special tax breaks for locating in largely Black areas; 57. Spending more money on schools in Black neighborhoods, especially for pre-school and early education programs; and 58. Provide special college scholarships for Black children who maintain good grades. Responses categories ranged from 1 strongly favor to 5 strongly oppose. The average was computed for questions 56-58. Refers to lack of support for race-based policy. A high score means lack of support.

APPENDIX D: FACTOR ANALYSIS

Table 1. Initial Factor Loadings for Opposition to Race-Based Policy, Racial Prejudice and Racism Items: Oblimin Rotation

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
1. Positive or negative feelings of Black supervisor	**1.019**				
2. Positive or negative feelings of racial equality	**.346**				
3. More influence of Blacks in local politics...		**.920**			
4. More good housing for Blacks...		**.868**			
5. More good jobs for Blacks...		**.797**			
6. Blacks trying to get ahead...		**.561**			
7. Irish...overcame prejudice, Blacks...			**.744**		
8. If Blacks would try harder...			**.732**		
9. Blacks could get along without welfare...			**.683**		
10. White superiority*				**.757**	
11. Each ethnic group should stay...*				**.665**	
12. Provide special college scholarships for Blacks...					**.606**
13. Generations of slavery and discrimination...*					**.557**
14. Spending more money on schools in Black neighborhoods...					**.550**
15. Blacks got less than they deserve*					**.548**
16. Giving business and industry special tax Breaks...					**.534**
Factor Correlations					
Factor 1	--				
Factor 2	.280	--			
Factor 3	.198	.382	--		
Factor 4	.262	.400	.254	--	
Factor 5	.236	.302	.428	.252	--

Note. Boldface indicates significant factor loadings.
Items indicated here are with abbreviated descriptions. See questionnaire for the full wording of each item.
*Direction of item was reversed before analysis

APPENDIX E: STEPWISE REGRESSION SUMMARY OF ALL SIGNIFICANT PREDICTORS

Table 1. Stepwise Regression Summary of all the Significant Predictors in the Overall Models Predicting All Five Dependent Measures

Variables	β	R^2
Symbolic racism		31.2%
Economic individualism	0.36***	
	(.020)	
Egalitarianism	-0.21***	
	(.040)	
Negative stereotypes	0.20***	
	(.039)	
Political conservatism	0.10***	
	(.019)	
Affective prejudice	0.08*	
	(.034)	
Threat		19.7%
Egalitarianism	-0.25***	
	(.039)	
Negative stereotypes	0.20***	
	(.039)	
Gender (male)	0.11***	
	(.047)	
Affective prejudice	0.11**	
	(.034)	
Rural	0.09**	
	(.051)	
Graduate degree (father)	-0.07*	
	(.068)	
Classical racism		12.1%
Egalitarianism	-0.24***	
	(.049)	
Negative stereotypes	0.15***	
	(.049)	
Diversity course requirement	-0.10**	
	(.058)	
Affective prejudice	0.08*	
	(.043)	

*p≤.05 **p≤.01 ***p≤.001 n= 820

Note: In bold are the criterion variables. Standard errors are in parentheses.

Table 1. (continued)

Variables	β	R^2
Stratification beliefs		21.3%
Egalitarianism	-0.39***	
	(.044)	
Affective prejudice	0.13***	
	(.037)	
Economic individualism	0.09**	
	(.023)	
Opposition to Race-based policy		20.0%
Egalitarianism	-0.30***	
	(.043)	
Affective prejudice	0.20***	
	(.037)	
Diversity course requirement	-0.09**	
	(.051)	
Economic individualism	-0.09**	
	(.022)	

*p≤.05 **p≤.01 ***p≤.001 n= 820

Note: In bold are the criterion variables. Standard errors are in parentheses.

REFERENCES

Advisory Board on Race and Racial Reconciliation. (1998, September). "President's initiative on race: Building one America for the 21st century." Retrieved June, 2003 from http://www. clinton3.nara.gov/Initiatives/OneAmerica/pirsummary.html

Banks, J. A. 1996. "Multicultural literacy and curriculum reform." In C. Turner, M. Garcia, A. Nora, and L. I. Rendon (Eds.), Racial and ethnic diversity in higher education, pp. 101-107. ASHE Reader Series. Neeham Heights, MA: Simon and Schuster.

Baron, R. and D. Kenny. 1986. "The Moderator-Mediator Variable Distinction in Social Psychological Research: Conceptual, Strategic, and Statistical Considerations." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 51, pp. 1173-82.

Berger, P. and T. Luckman. 1966. The Social Construction of Reality. New York, NY: Doubleday.

Berinsky, A. 1999. "The Two Faces of Public Opinion." American Journal of Political Science. 43, pp. 1209-30.

Blauner, R. 1989. Black Lives, White Lives: Three Decades of Race Relations in America. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Blumer, H. 1958. "Race Prejudice as a Sense of Group Position." Pacific Sociological Review. 1, pp. 3-7.

_____. 1965. "The Future of the Color Line," in J. McKinney and E. Thompson (eds.), The South in Continuity and Change, pp. 35-59. Durham: Seeman.

Bobo, L. and F. Licari. 1989. "Education and Political Tolerance." Political Opinion Quarterly. 53, pp. 285-308.

Bobo, L. and V. Hutchings. 1996. "Perceptions of Racial Group Competition: Extending Blumer's Theory of Group Position to a Multiracial Social Context." American Sociological Review. 61, pp. 951-972.

Bobo, L. and J. Kluegal. 1993. "Opposition to Race-Targeting: Self-Interest, Stratification Ideology, or Racial Attitudes." American Sociological Review. 58, pp. 443-464.

_____. 1997. "Status, Ideology, and Dimensions of Whites' Racial Beliefs and Attitudes: Progress and Stagnation." In S. A. Tuch and J. K. Martin (Eds.), Racial Attitudes in the 1990s: Continuity and Change, pp. 93-120. Westport CT: Praeger Publishers.

Bobo, L., J. Kluegel, and R. Smith. 1997. "Laissez-Faire Racism: The Crystallization of a Kinder, Gentler, Antiblack Ideology." In S. A. Tuch and J. K. Martin (eds.), Racial Attitudes in the 1990s: Continuity and Change, pp. 15-42. Westport CT: Praeger Publishers.

Bobo, L. 2000. "Race and Beliefs about Affirmative Action: Assessing the Effects of Interests, Group Threat, Ideology, and Racism." In D. Sears, J. Sidanius, and L. Bobo (Eds.), Racialized Politics: The Debate about Racism in America, pp. 137-164. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Bonilla-Silva, E. 2003. Racism without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States. New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Brezina, T. and K. Winder. 2003. "Economic Disadvantage, Status Generalization, and Negative Racial Stereotyping By White Americans." Social Psychology Quarterly. 66, pp. 402-418.

Campbell, D. and J. Stanley. 1963. Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Chang, M. 2001. "Is It More Than About Getting Along?: The Broader Educational Implications of Reducing Students' Racial Biases." Journal of College Student Development. 42, pp. 93-105.

Condran, J. G. 1979. "Changes in White attitudes toward Blacks: 1963-1977." Public Opinion Quarterly. 43, pp. 463-76.

Crosby, F., S. Bromley, and L. Saxe. 1980. "Recent Unobtrusive Studies of Black and White Discrimination and Prejudiced: A Literature Review." Psychological Bulletin. 87, pp. 546-63.

Demo, D. and M. Hughes. 1990. "Socialization and Racial Identity Among Black Americans." Social Psychological Quarterly. 43, pp. 364-374.

Dillman, D. 2000. Mail and Internet Surveys: The Tailored Design Method. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Downey, D and R. Torrecilha. 1994. "Sociology of Race and Ethnicity: Strategies for comparative multicultural courses." Teaching Sociology. 22, pp. 237-247.

Farely, R., C. Steeh, M. Krysan, T. Jackson, and K. Reeves. 1994. "Stereotypes and Segregation: Neighborhoods in the Detroit Area." American Journal of Sociology. 100, pp. 750-780.

Fazio, R. and B. Dunton. 1997. "An Individual Difference Measure of Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reaction." Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin. 23, pp. 316-326.

Feagin, J., H. Vera, and N. Imani. 1996. The Agony of Education: Black Students at White Colleges and Universities. New York, NY: Routledge.

Hughes, M. 1997. "Symbolic Racism, Old-Fashioned Racism, and Whites' Opposition to Affirmative Action." In S. A. Tuch and J. K. Martin (Eds.), Racial Attitudes in the 1990s: Continuity and Change, pp. 44-75. Westport CT: Praeger Publishers.

Hughes, M. and S. Tuch. 2003. "Gender Differences in Whites' Racial Attitudes: Are Women's Attitudes Really More Favorable?" Social Psychology Quarterly. 66, pp. 384-401.

Hurtado, S., J. Milem, A. Clayton-Pedersen, and W. Allen. 1999. Enacting diverse learning environments: Improving the climate for racial/ethnic diversity in higher education. Washington, DC: The George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development.

Hyman, H. and P. Sheatsley. 1956. "Attitudes on Integration." Scientific American. 195, pp. 35-39.

Jaccard, J., R. Turrisi, C. Wan. 1990. Interaction Effects in Multiple Regression. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Jackman, M. R. 1978. 1978. "General and Applied Tolerance: Does Education Increase Commitment to Racial Integration?" American Journal of Political Science. 22, pp. 302-324.

Jackman, M. R., and M. J. Muha. 1984. "Education and Intergroup Attitudes: Moral Englightment, Superficial Democratic Commitment, or Ideological Refinement?" American Sociological Review. 49, pp. 751-769.

Jacob, P. E. 1957. Changing Values in College. New York: Harper & Row.

Jakubowski, L. 2001. "Teaching Uncomfortable Topics: An Action-Oriented Strategy for Addressing Racism and Related Forms of Difference." Teaching Sociology. 29, pp. 62-79.

Johnson, M. and M. Marini. 1998. "Bridging the Racial Divide in the United States: The Effect of Gender." Social Psychology Quarterly. 61, pp. 247-58.

Jones, J. 1972. Prejudice and Racism. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Kane, E. and E. Kyyrö 2001. "For Whom Does Education Enlighten? Race, Gender, Education, and Beliefs About Social Inequality." Gender and Society. 15, pp. 710-33.

Kerr, C. 2001. The Uses of the University. Fifth Edition Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Kinder, D. and D. Sears. 1981. "Prejudice and Politics: Symbolic Racism versus Racial Threats to Good Life." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 40, pp. 414-431.

Kinloch, G. C. 1974. "Racial prejudice in highly and less racist societies: Social distance preferences among White college students in South Africa and Hawaii." Sociology and Social Research. 59, pp. 1-13.

Kleinpenning, G. and L. Hagendoorn. 1993. "Forms of Racism and the Cumulative Dimension of Ethnic Attitudes." Social Psychological Quarterly. 56, pp. 21-36.

Kluegal, J. 1990. "Trends in Whites' Explanations of the Gap in Black-White Socioeconomic Status, 1977-1989." American Sociological Review. 55. pp. 512-525.

Krysan, M. 2000. "Prejudice, Politics, and Public Opinion: Understanding the Sources of Racial Policy Attitudes." Annual Review of Sociology. 26, pp. 135-168.

Lucal, B. 1996. "Oppression and Privilege: Toward a Relational Conceptualization of Race." Teaching Sociology. 26, pp. 259-275.

Margolis, M. and K. E. Haque. 1981. "Applied tolerance or fear of government? An alternative interpretation of Jackman's findings." American Journal of Political Science. 25, pp. 241-255.

Marullo, S. 1998. "Bringing Home Diversity: A Service Learning Approach to Teaching Race and Ethnic Relations." Teaching Sociology. 26, pp. 259-275.

Massey, D. and N. Denton. 1993. American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mead, G. 1934. Mind, Self, and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Myrdal, G. 1944. An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy. New York: Random House.

Muir, D. E., & L. W. Muir. 1988. "Social distance between deep-south middle-school Whites and Blacks." Sociology of Social Research. 72, pp. 177-80.

Nicol, A.A.M and P. M. Pexman. 1999. Presenting Your Findings: A Practical Guide for Creating Tables. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Obach, B. 2000. "Teaching About Institutional Discrimination and the Controversies of Affirmative Action." Teaching Sociology. 28, pp. 50-55.

Omi, M. and W. Howard. 1994. Racial Formation in the United States from 1960s to the 1990s. New York, NY: Routledge.

Pence, D. and J. Fields. 1999. "Teaching About Race and Ethnicity: Trying to Uncover White Privilege for a White Audience." Teaching Sociology. 27, pp. 150-158.

Pettigrew, T. 1997. "The Affective Component of Prejudice: Empirical Support for the New View." In S. A. Tuch and J. K. Martin (Eds.), Racial Attitudes in the 1990s: Continuity and Change, pp. 76-90. Westport CT: Praeger Publishers.

Pettigrew, T. 2000. "Systematizing the Predictors of Prejudice." In D. Sears, J. Sidanius, and L. Bobo (Eds.), Racialized Politics: The Debate about Racism in America, pp. 280-301. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Phelan, J., B. Link, A. Stuene, and R. Moore. 1995. "Education, Social Liberalism, and Economic conservatism: Attitudes toward Homeless People." American Sociological Review. 60, pp. 126-140.

Quinley, H. and C. Glock. 1979. Anti-Semitism in America. New York: Free Press.

Rhodes, F. 1998. "The University and its Critics." In W.G. Bowen and H.T. Shapiro (Eds.), Universities and Their Leadership, pp. 3-14. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rosovsky, H. 1991. The University: An owner's manual. New York: W. W. Norton and Company.

Rutstein, N. 1993. Healing Racism in United States. Springfield, MA; Whitcomb Publishing.

Sampson, W. 1986. "Desegregation and Racial tolerance in Academia." Journal of Negro Education. 55, pp. 171-84.

Schaefer, R. 1987. "Social Distance of Black college Students At a Predominantly White University." Sociology and Social Research. 72, pp. 30-33.

Schaefer, R. 1996. "Presidential Address Education and Prejudice: Unraveling the Relationship." The Sociological Quarterly. 37, pp. 1-16.

Sears, D. and P. Henry. 2003. "The Origins of Symbolic Racism." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 85, pp. 259-275.

Sears, D., P. Henry, and R. Kosterman. 2000. "Egalitarian values and Contemporary racial politics." In D. Sears, J. Sidanius, and L. Bobo (Eds.), Racialized politics: The Debate about Racism in America. pp. 75-117. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Sears, D., C. van Laar, M. Carrillo, and R. Kosterman. 1997. "Is it really racism? The origins of White Americans' opposition to race-targeted policies." Public Opinion Quarterly. 61, pp. 16-53.

Sears, D. and D. Kinder. 1971. "Racial Tensions and Voting Behavior in Los Angeles." In W. Z. Hirsch (Ed.), Los Angeles: Viability and Prospects for Metropolitan Leadership. New York: Praeger.

Sidanius, J., F. Pratto, and L. Bobo. 1996. "Racism, conservatism, affirmative action, and intellectual sophistication: A matter of principled conservatism or group dominance." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 70, pp. 476-490.

Sidanius, J., and F. Pratto. 1999. Social Dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sniderman, P. M., G. Crosby, and W. Howell. 2000. "The Politics of Race." In D. Sears, J. Sidanius, and L. Bobo (Eds.), Racialized politics: The Debate about Racism in America. pp. 236-279. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Steeh, C. and H. Schuman. 1992. "Young White Adults: Did Racial Attitudes Change in the 1980s?" American Journal of Sociology. 98, pp. 340-367.

Tumin, M., P. Barton, and B. Burrus. 1958. "Education, Prejudice and Discrimination: A Study in Readiness for Desegregation." American Sociological Review. 23, pp. 41-49.

Williams, D., J. Jackson, T. Brown, M. Torres, T. Forman, and K. Brown. 1999. "Traditional and Contemporary Prejudice and Urban Whites' support for Affirmative Action and Government Help." Social Problems. 46, pp. 503-527.

Wilson, W. J. 1973. Power Racism, and Privilege: Race Relations in Theoretical and Sociohistorical Perspectives. New York: The Free Press.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There is none other God but Thee, the Help in Peril, the Self-Subsisting.
—Bahá'u'lláh

My heart is filled with overwhelming emotion as I call to mind those individuals who have helped me transform my aspirations into reality. First, I would like to express my utmost appreciation and gratitude to Rafael Mellado, Scott Hoffman, and Mahmoud Abou-Elneel for their technical support, expertise in Internet survey construction, and computer assistance. Without their selfless guidance and assistance, I would not have been able to collect data using the World Wide Web. I am also grateful to my friend, Muhamed Yacoub, who was also completing his doctoral research at the same time I was but in a different field for his sense of humor, support, and encouragement. It was very helpful to share our dissertation woes with each other. Doing so relieved some of the tension we felt at times from being overwhelmed.

Next, I deeply appreciate and am profoundly grateful for the leadership and unwavering support of my co-major professors—Dr. Gloria Jones Johnson and Dr. Betty Dobratz. They hung in there with me from the beginning until the end. Without their scholarly insights, persistence in questioning my writing and methodological approach, and their suggestions for revisions, my dissertation would be sorely lacking the depth and breadth needed to address the role of higher education on reducing racial prejudice and racism.

I would also like to especially thank my dissertation committee for their valuable insights, support, and assistance: Dr. Carl Roberts, for his expertise in statistics and questionnaire writing; Dr. George Jackson, for writing to faculty in support of my research endeavors and his tireless commitment in making sure I succeed; and Dr. J. Herman Blake,

for holding me to the highest standards of excellence and showering me with profound wisdom and insight.

With utmost love, I want to express my sincerest gratitude and appreciation to my wife, Kristine Levonyan Radloff, and our two and a half year old son, Léon, for believing in me and enduring the pain of not being together from time to time so I could complete this dissertation. They are the love of my life.